

# For Reference

---

**NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM**

# For Reference

---

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS  
UNIVERSITATIS  
ALBERTAENSIS













Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2019 with funding from  
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Snelgrove1965>

7.7.85/5  
(94500)  
# 138

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A STUDY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE ROLE OF THE DISTRICT  
SUPERVISING INSPECTOR IN NEWFOUNDLAND

by

VERNON JOSHUA SNELGROVE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

JUNE, 1965



UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA  
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "A Study of the Administrative Role of the District Supervising Inspector in Newfoundland," submitted by Vernon Joshua Snelgrove, B.A., in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.



## ABSTRACT

This study presents a descriptive survey of the administrative role of the provincially appointed district supervising inspector in the province of Newfoundland. The investigation is primarily concerned with the legal status and method of selection of the inspector, the setting in which the inspector works, his preparation, functions and work load, and the distribution of his time among the various functions. The views of the inspector on the effectiveness of his performance, and on the least attractive and most attractive aspects of his work are also determined. The legal status of the inspector is compared with that of provincially appointed school superintendents elsewhere in Canada and the inspector's administrative role is examined in terms of relevant information found in the literature on provincially appointed superintendents.

In conducting the study, an examination was made of the sections of The Education Act, 1960, which relate to the duties of supervising inspectors, and of similar sections of the School Acts of other provinces. Authoritative literature on the school superintendency and a number of studies on provincially appointed superintendents were also reviewed. The major source of information, however, was a questionnaire which was completed by seventeen of the eighteen district supervising inspectors in the province.

The findings indicate that the legal status of the supervising inspector needs some clarification, especially with respect to inspector-board relationships. School boards are not encouraged by the Act





to seek the professional advice and assistance of inspectors in the administration of their schools and do not fully utilize the inspectors' potential services. Supervising inspectors perform only some of the functions which are being assigned to provincially appointed superintendents elsewhere in Canada and are primarily supervisors of instruction.

The findings also indicate that the large number of pupils, staff personnel and school boards in supervisory districts makes the tasks of providing adequate instructional supervision, and giving adequate professional guidance to boards impossible ones for supervising inspectors to perform without assistance. Adequate instructional supervision is impeded also by the large number of small schools in supervisory districts and by principals and teachers with inadequate professional training and experience.

The three most important recommendations growing out of the study are: (1) that the Department of Education should initiate a revision of The Education Act for the purpose of improving inspector-board relationships; (2) that the Department of Education and representatives of the Protestant denominations should seriously consider school district reorganization with a view to consolidation of school boards wherever possible on both a denominational and an amalgamated basis; and (3) that the Department of Education should make a thorough study of the potential work loads of supervising inspectors, the purposes of which should be to occasion an equitable distribution of responsibilities among them and assignment of an optimum number of school boards and staff personnel in each supervisory district.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance and advice given throughout the preparation of this thesis by Dr. F. Enns, chairman of the thesis committee, and to thank Dr. E. Miklos and Dr. L. D. Nelson, members of the thesis committee, for their suggestions and criticisms.

Sincere thanks are extended to the district supervising inspectors in Newfoundland who gave of their valuable time to complete the questionnaire, and to those officials of the Department of Education who supplied invaluable information.

Finally, the writer wishes to express his appreciation for the financial aid rendered by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
The Problem . . . . .	2
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	2
Statement of the Sub-Problems . . . . .	2
Hypotheses . . . . .	4
Assumptions . . . . .	5
Delimitation of the Study . . . . .	5
Significance of the Study . . . . .	5
Procedure Followed in Carrying out Investigation . . . . .	6
The Questionnaire . . . . .	6
Analysis and Presentation of Data . . . . .	7
Definitions of Terms Used . . . . .	8
II. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM . . . . .	11
The Newfoundland Educational System . . . . .	11
General Organization . . . . .	11
Background of the Denominational System . . . . .	13
Relationship Between Central and Local Authorities . . . . .	14
Historical Development of Inspection and Supervision . . . . .	18
Early Development . . . . .	19
Present Structure . . . . .	21
Summary . . . . .	26





CHAPTER	PAGE
III. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE ON THE SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT . .	29
Statutory Provisions Governing the Provincially Appointed	
School Superintendent in Canada . . . . .	29
Training for the Superintendency . . . . .	31
Pre-Service Training . . . . .	31
In-Service Training . . . . .	35
Qualifications for the Superintendency . . . . .	36
Organization for Effective Administration . . . . .	37
Executive Status of Provincially Appointed Superintendent.	37
Unitary Leadership . . . . .	41
The Provincially Appointed Superintendent and Educational	
Policy . . . . .	42
The Superintendent as a Professional Advisor . . . . .	42
Reluctance of Boards to Solicit Advice . . . . .	45
The Provincially Appointed Superintendent and the	
Supervision of Instruction . . . . .	47
Nature of Instructional Supervision . . . . .	47
Need for Supervision . . . . .	48
The Superintendent's Responsibilities for Supervision . .	50
Time Devoted to Supervision . . . . .	52
Related Studies . . . . .	54
Summary of Chapter . . . . .	58
IV. LEGAL STATUS AND METHOD OF SELECTION OF SUPERVISING INSPECTORS	60
The Legal Status of the Supervising Inspector . . . . .	60
Specific Duties of the Supervising Inspector . . . . .	61



## CHAPTER

## PAGE

Selection of Supervising Inspectors . . . . .	65
Qualifications Required for Selection . . . . .	65
Summary . . . . .	68
V. THE SETTING IN WHICH THE SUPERVISING INSPECTOR WORKS AND	
THE BACKGROUND OF THE INSPECTOR . . . . .	70
Setting . . . . .	70
Supervisory Districts . . . . .	70
Number and Total Enrollment of Schools . . . . .	74
Sizes, Types and Religious Denominations of Schools . . . .	76
Number and Religious Denominations of School Boards . . . .	80
Number of Principals and Teachers and Their Professional	
Qualifications and Experience . . . . .	82
Overlap in Supervisory Districts and in Administrative	
Responsibilities for School Systems . . . . .	87
Background of the Supervising Inspector . . . . .	88
Academic Qualifications, Teaching and Administrative	
Experience . . . . .	88
Pre-Service and In-Service Administrative Training . . . .	92
Comparison of Qualifications of Supervising Inspectors,	
Principals and Teachers . . . . .	100
Summary . . . . .	100
VI. FUNCTIONS AND WORK LOAD OF THE SUPERVISING INSPECTOR . . . .	104
Advisory and Executive Functions: Supervisor-School Board	
Relationships . . . . .	104



## CHAPTER

## PAGE

Proportion of Boards Soliciting Assistance, and	
Services Rendered by Supervising Inspectors . . . . .	105
Involvement in Administrative Duties . . . . .	111
Need for More Professional Assistance and Guidance . . . .	117
How Professional Assistance Should Be Provided . . . . .	118
Consolidation of Boards and Educational Efficiency . . . .	119
Most Satisfying and Most Difficult Aspects of	
Supervisor-Board Relationships . . . . .	120
Supervisory Function: Supervisor-Principal-Teacher	
Relationships . . . . .	124
Time Devoted to Instructional Supervision . . . . .	124
The Inspector's Approach to Instructional Supervision . .	132
Adequacy of Supervisory Services . . . . .	133
Supervisor-Department of Education Relationships . . . . .	134
The Inspector and Policy-Making at the Provincial Level .	136
Work Load and Distribution of the Supervising Inspector's	
Time . . . . .	137
Length of Work Week . . . . .	137
Percentage and Amount of Time Devoted to Various Duties .	139
Supervision of instruction . . . . .	139
Executing school board policies . . . . .	139
Work for Department of Education . . . . .	141
Attendance at board meetings and interviews with members	141
Travel for professional purposes . . . . .	143





CHAPTER	PAGE
Other reports and correspondence . . . . .	143
In-service training . . . . .	143
Miscellaneous activities . . . . .	145
Desirable Distribution of the Supervisor's Time . . . . .	145
Least Attractive and Most Attractive Aspects of Work . . . . .	146
Summary . . . . .	147
VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	151
Summary . . . . .	151
Conclusions . . . . .	160
Recommendations . . . . .	162
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	166
APPENDIX . . . . .	173





# LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Number of Supervising Inspectors in Relation to Teachers and Pupils in all Newfoundland Schools since 1944 . . . . .	25
II. Area in Square Miles of Supervisory Districts . . . . .	71
III. Number of Towns and Villages in Supervisory Districts . . .	73
IV. Total Number of Schools in Sixteen Supervisory Districts in Newfoundland . . . . .	75
V. Pupil Population of Supervisory Districts . . . . .	75
VI. Number of Classrooms and Religious Denominations of All- Grade Schools (Grades I-XI) in Supervisory Districts . . .	77
VII. Number of Classrooms and Religious Denominations of Elemen- tary Schools (Grades I-VI-VIII) in Supervisory Districts .	77
VIII. Number of Classrooms and Religious Denominations of High Schools in Supervisory Districts . . . . .	79
IX. Number of School Boards in Supervisory Districts . . . . .	81
X. Number of School Boards in Supervisory Districts by Religious Denomination . . . . .	81
XI. Number of Principals in Supervisory Districts . . . . .	83
XII. Number of Teachers in Supervisory Districts Including Teachers in One-Room Schools . . . . .	83
XIII. Professional Qualifications of Principals in Supervisory Districts . . . . .	84
XIV. Professional Qualifications of Teachers in Supervisory Districts . . . . .	86



## TABLE

## PAGE

XV.	Academic Qualifications of District Supervising Inspectors .	89
XVI.	Years of Experience of Supervising Inspectors as Classroom Teachers . . . . .	89
XVII.	Years of Experience of Supervising Inspectors as Elementary Teachers . . . . .	91
XVIII.	Years of Experience of Supervising Inspectors as Teaching and/or Full-Time Principals . . . . .	91
XIX.	Largest Number of Classrooms Administered by Supervising Inspectors as School Principals . . . . .	93
XX.	Experience of Supervising Inspectors in Present Positions . .	93
XXI.	Pre-Service Administrative Preparation Considered Helpful by Supervising Inspectors . . . . .	95
XXII.	Administrative Areas in which Supervising Inspectors Lacked Pre-Service Preparation for Tasks . . . . .	95
XXIII.	In-Service Administrative Training Considered Helpful by Supervising Inspectors . . . . .	97
XXIV.	Training Considered Desirable by Supervising Inspectors . . .	98
XXV.	Number of Supervisory Districts in which One or More Prin- cipals have attained Higher Academic Qualifications than the Supervising Inspector . . . . .	101
XXVI.	Number of Supervisory Districts in which One or More Teachers have attained Higher Academic Qualifications than the Supervising Inspector . . . . .	101



## TABLE

## PAGE

XXVII.	Number and Percentage of School Boards in Each District which Solicit the Professional Services of Supervising Inspectors . . . . .	106
XXVIII.	Administrative Areas in which Supervising Inspectors are Requested to Provide Most Assistance by Boards . . . . .	107
XXIX.	Number of Times Annually Supervising Inspectors Meet all Boards in their Respective Supervisory Districts . . . . .	110
XXX.	Number of Times Annually Supervising Inspectors Could Meet Boards in Supervisory Districts if Requested . . . . .	112
XXXI.	The Degree to which Supervising Inspectors Assume Administrative Duties for School Boards . . . . .	112
XXXII.	Arrangements for the Performance of Administrative Duties when Supervising Inspectors are only Partially Responsible or not Involved . . . . .	116
XXXIII.	Most Satisfying Aspects of Supervisor-Board Relationships .	121
XXXIV.	Most Difficult Aspects of Supervisor-Board Relationships .	123
XXXV.	Number of Visits Made Annually by Supervising Inspectors to Each School in their Respective Supervisory Districts.	125
XXXVI.	Number of Days Given Annually to the Supervision of Instruction by District Supervising Inspectors . . . . .	126 <sup>a</sup>
XXXVII.	Number of Days Spent Annually in Classroom Visitation and Mean Number of Days Given to Each Teacher by Supervisors.	127
XXXVIII.	Number of Days Given Annually to Group Meetings and Con- ferences with Teachers by Supervising Inspectors . . . . .	129





## TABLE

## PAGE

XXXIX.	Number of Days Spent Annually on Teachers' Workshops by Supervising Inspectors . . . . .	129
XL.	Number of Days Spent with Principals Annually in Various Supervisory Activities by Supervising Inspectors . . . . .	131
XLI.	Methods Advocated by Supervising Inspectors to Improve Instructional Supervision in Supervisory Districts . . . . .	135
XLII.	Number of Hours Spent in Administration Weekly by Super- vising Inspectors . . . . .	138
XLIII.	Percentage of Time Devoted to the Supervision of Instruc- tion by Supervising Inspectors . . . . .	140
XLIV.	Percentage of Time Spent in Executing School Board Policies by Supervising Inspectors . . . . .	140
XLV.	Percentage of Time Spent on Work for the Department of Education by Supervising Inspectors . . . . .	142
XLVI.	Percentage of Time Given to Board Meetings and Interviews with Members by Inspectors . . . . .	142
XLVII.	Percentage of Time Spent on Travel by Supervising Inspectors.	144



## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM

#### INTRODUCTION

Because education is a provincial responsibility in Canada, differences in educational patterns have developed in the provinces. During recent years, however, some common trends seem to have emerged. Improved communications, greater intercourse among the provinces, and the importance which has been attached recently to education in a highly technological age probably explain the tendency of provincial educational systems to become more uniform.

The administrative role of the provincially appointed school superintendent seems to have undergone similar changes simultaneously in several of the provinces. For example, in addition to exercising his strictly regulatory function for the Department of Education, the superintendent of education has tended to become an advisor, a supervisor of instruction and an executive officer for local boards of education.

Studies by Hencley,<sup>1</sup> Finlay,<sup>2</sup> and Stewart<sup>3</sup> have analyzed various

---

<sup>1</sup>S. P. Hencley, "A Descriptive Survey of the Alberta Divisional and County School Superintendent" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1958).

<sup>2</sup>J. H. Finlay, "Expectations of School Boards for the Role of the Provincially Appointed Superintendent of Schools in Alberta" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1961).

<sup>3</sup>L. D. Stewart, "An Analysis of the Role of the Assistant Superintendent in Alberta School Divisions and Counties" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1961).



aspects of the superintendency in the province of Alberta, while Collins<sup>4</sup> and Miller<sup>5</sup> approached the position on a nation-wide basis. No attempt, however, has yet been made to study the administrative role of the provincially appointed district supervising inspector in the province of Newfoundland. Since little actual evidence exists regarding what is encompassed in this position, such a study is appropriate at this time.

Newfoundland's historical background is considerably different from that of the other provinces. Until 1949, the province was not a part of Canada, and for a period was governed by a commission appointed by the British government. The denominational system of education which had developed remained after Newfoundland joined Canada and it is within this system that the district supervising inspector works.

## I. THE PROBLEM

### Purpose of the Study

This study is concerned with a descriptive survey of the present administrative role of the provincially appointed district supervising inspector in the province of Newfoundland.

### Statement of the Sub-Problems

A consideration of the problem requires a study of the following

---

<sup>4</sup>C. P. Collins, "The Role of the Provincially Appointed Superintendent of Schools in Larger Units of Administration in Canada (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1958).

<sup>5</sup>S. A. Miller, "A Comparative Study of Supervision in the Various Canadian Provinces, with a View to Determining the Optimum Load for Supervisors of Each Type" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1946).





sub-problems:

1. The legal status of the district supervising inspector and the method of selection of the inspector;
2. The setting in which the supervising inspector works--the potential magnitude of the job: size of supervisory district in area; number and sizes of settlements; number, total enrollment, sizes, types and religious denominations of schools; number and religious denominations of school boards; number of principals and teachers; the academic qualifications and experience of principals and of teaching staffs; the degree of overlap in the organization of the supervisory district;
3. The background of the supervising inspector: his academic qualifications, his experience as a teacher and principal, his specific pre-service and in-service administrative training and the supervisor's views on administrative training;
4. The functions and work load of the supervising inspector and his views on the effectiveness of his performance:
  - (a) Functions: supervisor-board relationships, advisory and executive functions; supervisor-principal-teacher relationships, supervisory function; supervisor-department of education relationships, advisory function;
  - (b) Work load and distribution of the supervising inspector's time: length of work week; percentage of time actually





devoted to the various duties and percentage of time considered desirable by the supervisor for the performance of the various duties; the least attractive aspects and the most attractive aspects of the supervising inspector's work.

### Hypotheses

The hypotheses advanced in this study are not tested statistically. The study is mainly descriptive and exploratory and does not lend itself to statistical analysis. The following hypotheses are advanced to help focus the study:

1. The legal status of the supervising inspector in Newfoundland is defined vaguely in some respects and needs clarification through revision;
2. The level of formal training of the incumbents of the position is below what is customary in Canada and does not reach the standards suggested in the literature for the school superintendent;
3. Supervising inspectors are performing only some of the functions which are being assigned to superintendents elsewhere in Canada and which are suggested in the literature for the superintendency;
4. The supervisors' efforts in their performed functions seem to be too thinly spread for the desired effectiveness;
5. Supervising inspectors concentrate their efforts in the supervision of instruction.



### Assumptions

An assumption is made in connection with the method used in the collection of data for this study. It is assumed that the respondents to the questionnaire were frank and objective. Every precaution was taken to ensure clarity and understanding in all questions used. It is further assumed that many of the concepts of the superintendent's role as described in Canadian literature, and to some extent in American literature, are applicable to the district supervising inspector in Newfoundland.

### Delimitation of the Study

This study is limited to a descriptive survey of the administrative role of the provincially appointed district supervising inspector in the province of Newfoundland. Although reference is made to one or two supervisors appointed by local boards of education, no attempt is made to analyze their roles. This limitation is justifiable since the number of locally appointed supervisors in Newfoundland is very small.

## II. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Research, conducted on the school superintendency in the United States and in some parts of Canada in recent years, has helped to clarify and elucidate the nature of this position. This has been extremely useful, since the role of the superintendent is generally a complex one due to the large number of alter groups. A study of the administrative role of the district supervising inspector in Newfoundland should be of some value since the supervisor's role remains obscure



because of a lack of research.

The legal status of the supervising inspector seems to be quite vague with respect to relationships with school boards and was described in The Canadian Superintendent in these words:

Supervisors, themselves, have complained from time to time that their status is not clearly defined and that they find it difficult to know just where their authority begins and ends. Legally their authority is, in fact, quite vague.<sup>6</sup>

In view of the lack of research, and the evident obscurity of the supervisor's legal status, a study of the administrative role of the supervising inspector is undertaken at this time.

### III. PROCEDURE FOLLOWED IN CARRYING OUT INVESTIGATION

In order to carry out the primary purposes of this study, information was collected from three main sources: The Education Act of Newfoundland, the Department of Education, and the supervising inspectors themselves. Since the information required from the two former sources was procured from an examination of the Act and by correspondence with the Department of Education, the following discussion is concerned primarily with the collection of data from the supervising inspectors. It shows how the questionnaire was developed and how the information was analyzed after it was received.

#### The Questionnaire

A questionnaire for the district supervising inspectors of

---

<sup>6</sup>The Canadian Association of School Superintendents and Inspectors, "The Position of the School Inspector in Newfoundland," The Canadian Superintendent, V (May, 1957), 80.







Newfoundland was designed to gather information regarding the total relationships of the inspectors to their supervisory districts and to the Department of Education. To accomplish the design, the instrument was divided into three sections: supervisory district; background of the supervising inspector; and functions, work load of supervising inspector and views about the effectiveness of functions. The headings were selected and questions phrased only after a thorough study of the literature on the school superintendency. Ideas for the construction of the questionnaire came also from theses by Hencley<sup>7</sup> and Malmberg.<sup>8</sup> During its development, the questionnaire was changed and modified several times as a result of constructive suggestions by several people, including persons closely associated with the Newfoundland educational system. Completed copies of the questionnaire were returned by seventeen of the eighteen district supervising inspectors. A copy of this instrument may be found in the appendix.

#### Analysis and Presentation of Data

The legal status of the supervising inspector and the method of selection are established in Chapter IV. In Chapters V and VI, the information obtained from the supervising inspectors is presented and discussed. This information is organized under general headings which correspond with the main headings used in the questionnaire and, as far as possible, with concepts from the related literature.

---

<sup>7</sup>Hencley, op. cit.

<sup>8</sup>H. Malmberg, "The Principal as a Supervisor of Instruction in the Regional School Districts of New Brunswick" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1959).



The information from the first section of the questionnaire is intended to provide a picture of the potential educational responsibilities of the supervising inspectors. This information relates to the sizes of the supervisory districts; types of settlements; numbers, total enrollments, sizes, types and religious denominations of schools; numbers and religious denominations of boards; numbers of principals and teachers and their academic qualifications and experience; and the degree of overlap in the organization of the supervisory districts. The second section of the questionnaire describes the backgrounds of the supervising inspectors: their teaching and administrative experience; their academic and administrative pre-service and in-service training and their views on training. The third section of the questionnaire relates to the functions and tasks of the supervising inspectors; work loads, distributions of time, their views on their effectiveness, and the desired allocations of time for administrative tasks. This section of the questionnaire also presents the most attractive and least attractive aspects of the supervising inspectors' work.

The data considered most significant are presented in tabular form when that is appropriate. Comparisons are made in respondents' answers to the various questions asked.

In Chapter VII, the data are summarized and conclusions and recommendations are made in the light of the related literature.

#### IV. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

1. Administration is the process of facilitating the development



of goals and policies basic to teaching and learning, and procuring and managing personnel and material to implement teaching and learning.<sup>9</sup>

2. Executive function for the purpose of this study includes implementing the law as set forth by statute, departmental regulation or board regulation; implementing general policies of the board of education and the department of education; and supervising personnel, funds and facilities.

3. Supervision as a part of the executive function is a cooperative activity concerned with guiding individuals toward professional development and the improvement of the instructional program, through classroom visitation, individual and group conferences with teachers, and through other means directed towards the improvement of the teaching-learning situation.

4. Advisory function is probably the one emphasized most recently in the superintendent's tasks. Advice is given on the basis of experience and knowledge, to the board of education and the department of education, but the responsibility for the results of action lies with the board or the department of education.

5. Supervising Inspector or Supervisor refers to the official in Newfoundland charged with the types of responsibilities generally assigned to school superintendents in other provinces of Canada.

6. Superintendent refers to the provincially appointed school

---

<sup>9</sup>Roald F. Campbell, John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration (Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1958), p. 67.





superintendent.





## CHAPTER II

### BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

A study of one aspect of an educational organization can hardly be made objectively unless the total educational organization is thoroughly understood. Therefore, the Newfoundland educational system is described with two purposes in mind. The first is to show the general organization of the denominational system while the second purpose is to establish the relationships between central and local authorities. It is felt that a study of the supervising inspector's role also necessitates an understanding of the development of inspection and supervision.

#### I. THE NEWFOUNDLAND EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Since the educational system of the province is relatively complex and unlike other provincial systems, a general overview should precede details.

##### General Organization

The educational system of the province is unique in that it is not a state system in the usual sense, nor is it a denominational system in which the church provides and maintains the schools. There are actually five school systems,<sup>1</sup> all of which operate under the one central

---

<sup>1</sup>Roman Catholic, Anglican, United Church of Canada, Salvation Army and Pentecostal Assemblies.



authority. Frecker describes the system as a public school system operating within a denominational framework.<sup>2</sup> The Council of Education, which virtually decides the policy of the central authority, is comprised of one representative from each of the five recognized religious denominations, the Deputy Minister and the Minister of Education. The denominational representatives on the Council of Education are the directors of education for the denominational systems. Rowe explains that the provincial government actually controls education since it votes the money which makes the system possible. However, policy is determined by the Council of Education.<sup>3</sup>

There are local boards of education of five or more persons which operate in some three hundred fifteen educational districts throughout the province under the direction of the denominational chief superintendents and the director of amalgamated schools<sup>4</sup> of the Department of Education. During recent years, the trend towards centralization of schools has undoubtedly diminished the potential number of school boards as well as schools. Tucker states that between 1953 and 1961 forty-four centralized high schools were established in the province.<sup>5</sup> It is apparent however, that a denominational system of

---

<sup>2</sup>G. A. Frecker, Education in the Atlantic Provinces (Toronto: W. J. Gage and Company, Ltd., 1956), pp. 60-61.

<sup>3</sup>F. W. Rowe, The History of Education in Newfoundland (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1952), p. 1.

<sup>4</sup>Amalgamated schools are operated by the amalgamation of two or more of the five major denominations.

<sup>5</sup>Otto G. Tucker, "Centralized High Schools in Newfoundland" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1963), p. 111.



education inevitably results in a multitude of educational districts and schools.

#### Background of the Denominational System

A study of the history of education of the province reveals that the denominational system stemmed from the so-called voluntary system of education of the early nineteenth century. Schools at that time were operated mainly by religious and philanthropic societies. Indeed, the influence of the church on early settlement was pronounced. Warren states that where groups settled in larger communities they did so on a denominational basis and the parish became the centre of government.<sup>6</sup>

When the government became involved in education in 1836, a committee of the assembly recommended that financial grants be placed at the disposal of the religious and philanthropic groups operating schools. In 1843 the country was divided into eighteen Roman Catholic districts and eighteen Protestant districts. In the succeeding years a conflict developed among the Protestant groups to such a degree that the state sub-divided the Protestant grants among the larger denominations in 1874. In 1876 Roman Catholic, Church of England and Methodist superintendents of education were appointed.<sup>7</sup> The denominational system of education was becoming firmly entrenched.

In 1893, a member of the executive council of the country, the

---

<sup>6</sup>Philip J. Warren, "Leadership Expectations of the Principal in Newfoundland's Regional and Central High Schools as Perceived by Principals and Staffs" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1959), p. 4.

<sup>7</sup>Rowe, op. cit., pp. 78-87.







colonial secretary, was made responsible for education and a department of education was established in 1920 which, during the years of the Commission government, was presided over by a Commissioner for Home Affairs and Education. When Newfoundland joined Canada in 1949, a Ministry of Education was re-created and the chief civil servant of the department became the deputy minister of education.<sup>8</sup>

Some of the weaknesses of the denominational system as enumerated by Frecker include the tendency of the system to become unwieldy and complex as denominations grow and seek recognition; the inefficiency of operation caused by two or three small schools operating side by side; the difficulty of introducing changes because the Council of Education, the policy-making body, operates by unanimous agreement of the participating denominations rather than by majority decisions.<sup>9</sup>

#### Relationship Between Central and Local Authorities

Historically educational administration in Canada follows two distinct paths, one in the provincial department of education and the other in the local school district. With a view to determining the relationship between the central and local authorities in Newfoundland, the various sections of The Education Act, 1960, dealing with the constitution, duties and powers of school boards are brought together and summarized. Section 6 of the Act states that a school board may be

---

<sup>8</sup>C. E. Phillips, The Development of Education in Canada (Toronto: W. J. Gage Ltd., 1957), p. 215.

<sup>9</sup>Frecker, op. cit., pp. 64-65.



appointed in each district by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council on the recommendation of the appropriate chief superintendent. The board must consist of five or more persons, one of whom must be the senior clergyman or other officer of the denomination of the district. Every school board is a corporation and for the transaction of business a majority of members is a quorum.

The duties of school boards are specified in section 12 of The Education Act, 1960. The duties of each board are as follows:

1. To organize the means of elementary or secondary education or both by opening and maintaining public schools;
2. To promote night schools and continuation classes for those unable to attend public school;
3. To appoint and dismiss teachers and to notify the appropriate chief superintendent of appointments and vacancies existing;
4. To furnish to the proper chief superintendent an audited financial statement annually and any other information regarding the expenditure of money when requested;
5. To hold at least one meeting each year and such others as may be found necessary;
6. To prescribe courses of studies and text books subject to the written consent of the Council of Education;
7. To erect buildings of sufficient capacity and to see that such buildings are furnished, heated, ventilated, cleaned, inspected and maintained;
8. To manage and expend all moneys allocated to the board from whatever source;



9. To determine the periods of vacation in the schools under its management;

10. To hold an annual conference with the teachers engaged by the school board to consider the needs of education in the district;

11. To establish good public relations.

In addition to the mandatory duties listed, boards are given a number of discretionary powers to enable them to fulfill their responsibilities. Some of these powers are as follows:

1. Subject to the approval of the Council of Education, to make regulations, rules and by-laws prescribing and adopting its constitution, providing for the calling of and conduct of business at its meetings, the discipline of its schools, and the assignment of classes;

2. To purchase, hold, sell and convey property;

3. To establish and maintain teachers' residences;

4. Subject to the approval of the appropriate chief superintendent to borrow money for educational purposes;

5. To devise a scale of fees, subject to the approval of the Council of Education, to be charged in its schools.

The departmental regulations which have special significance for boards are The Education (Remuneration of Teachers and Grants to Boards) Regulations, 1958 and The Education (Teachers' Salaries) Regulations, 1963. These regulations deal with payment of teachers' salaries, and maintenance grants to school boards. The payment of maintenance grants is subject to four provisions. These are as follows:

1. The board must raise locally an amount equal to at least 25 per





cent of the maintenance grant.

2. Pupils must not be obliged to take part in the cleaning of the school.

3. Pupils must not engage personally in bringing fuel of any kind to school.

4. School cleaning must not be done at a time when school would normally be in session.

Special grants are available for libraries, science equipment and other purposes but these grants depend on certain specified conditions which have to be met also.

The Department of Education exercises sufficient control over the schools to ensure that certain standards are achieved. It can be seen that this control is exercised in several ways. The major cost of education is borne by the provincial government; however, construction grants and maintenance grants are issued only after certain specified conditions are met by the school board. Several controls are also built into the powers held by the board. The Council of Education must approve board expenditures, courses of study, the constitution, by-laws, and regulations of the board as well as fees charged. Provincial authorities are also responsible for pupil attendance, for the training and classification of teachers, for setting public examinations which are used in most schools, and for determining the length of the school day and year.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, 1 Elizabeth II, c. 105: The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1956, 5 Elizabeth II, No. 8.





It is difficult to ascertain the exact extent of local control in education in Newfoundland. Although boards are given a number of permissive powers, the way in which these powers are actually used is subject to the approval of the Council of Education or the appropriate chief superintendent.

Local boards of education, however, have almost complete control over the way in which the mandatory duties are performed. Boards are required to provide educational facilities to meet the needs of the people in the school districts. The facilities can be elaborate or meagre depending upon the desires and the financial status of the people and the boards. Boards must decide which administrators, teachers and other personnel are appointed to operate their schools and teach the students who attend them. Boards have to decide, to a large extent, what educational programs are going to be developed and offered to students in their schools, although courses of study and text books used are subject to the final approval of the Council of Education. In these and several other ways, boards exercise a high degree of control.

It is evident from a review of the Act that education in Newfoundland is neither completely controlled by the central authority nor by the local boards of education. Both the central authority and local boards exercise a large measure of control and responsibility.

## II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF INSPECTION AND SUPERVISION

Inspection and supervision developed gradually in the province with differences underlying the philosophy of inspection and supervision



at different periods.

### Early Development

Although progressive movements in education seem to have lagged in Newfoundland in comparison with other areas in British North America, inspection and supervision actually began at about the same time as it did in other parts of the continent. The government first appointed inspectors in 1843, the year in which the country was first divided into educational districts and grants to education increased. The trend towards a dominant role in supervision by the central authority in Newfoundland and in other parts of British North America at the time was, to some extent, following practice in England where after 1839 inspectors were the employees of the central authority.<sup>11</sup> Rowe states that inspection arose in Newfoundland out of the need for some accounting of funds being spent by the state and for some control over the selection of teachers in the many isolated areas, where boards were forced of necessity, sometimes, to employ incompetent personnel.<sup>12</sup> Prior to 1843, there was some inspection in the schools of the country, but the societies which were responsible for education employed personnel who often knew very little about education and who did not pursue inspection on a systematic basis.

The first legislative action concerning inspection required that one inspector appointed by the governor visit all schools supported or established by the state, at least once each year, and report on the

---

<sup>11</sup>Phillips, op. cit., p. 244.

<sup>12</sup>Rowe, op. cit., pp. 120-121.





character of the teacher, the proficiency of the scholars and upon any other points considered worthwhile.<sup>13</sup> Inspection at that time did not encompass the modern concept of supervision.

As an indication of the government's increasing interest in the state of education, an Act of 1858 made provision for two inspectors, one Roman Catholic and the other Protestant, both of whom were to make annual reports to be submitted to the legislature. It seems that the inspectors at that time were required to go beyond the former task of inspecting and reporting to assume responsibility for suggesting improvements.

Because of sectarian differences within the Protestant groups, the government found it necessary to appoint two Protestant inspectors in 1874. To facilitate greater denominational supervision, an Act of 1876 changed the office of inspector to superintendent, and between 1876 and 1916 the major portion of inspection was done by the superintendents.<sup>14</sup>

An Act of 1920 was the first legislation to approach inspection in a professional manner but several years passed before it could be implemented. It indicated a movement away from inspection and towards helpful supervision. Recognition was also given to the need for professional personnel to undertake the supervisory tasks. The Governor-in-Council was vested with the authority to appoint eleven supervising inspectors representative of the religious denominations. These supervising inspectors were not to replace the superintendents who would

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.      <sup>14</sup>Ibid., pp. 125-126.





remain as the directors of education. The economy of the country prevented the implementation of this legislation until 1935 when, with some amendment, it was finally implemented. In that year, twelve appointments were made and each supervisor was given a district in which the majority of schools were of his religious affiliation. With minor exceptions, each supervisor visited all of the schools in the area irrespective of religion. A new approach to supervision was also introduced. Rowe quotes from the writings of L. W. Shaw in the annual report of the Department of Education for 1942 in this manner:

The work of the Supervisory staff, like that of the Teaching staff, has for its object the improvement of instruction. In a country like Newfoundland such a task is by no means an easy one. . . .In the field itself, classroom visitation, conferences with teachers, chairmen and parents cannot but be helpful and stimulating, especially to those labouring under difficult conditions and in the more isolated sections.<sup>15</sup>

### Present Structure

At the present time there are twenty-two supervisory districts in the province. Denominationally, the districts may be classified in the following manner upon the basis of which supervising inspectors are appointed: seven Roman Catholic, seven Anglican, seven United Church and one Salvation Army. Appointed by the Minister of Education, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, the supervising inspector performs his duties in both elementary and secondary education under the direction of one of the five chief superintendents, depending upon the religious affiliation of the supervising inspector and the board

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 129.



of education with which he is concerned. For example, a Roman Catholic supervisor's relations with a United Church board in his district are reported usually to the United Church chief superintendent. However, in practice, since the province is settled along denominational lines, a supervising inspector of a particular religious affiliation is generally responsible to the chief superintendent of that religious denomination.

Within the province, there are regional high school systems<sup>16</sup> which, strictly speaking, are not under the jurisdiction of supervising inspectors. Dawe states that these systems fall under the jurisdiction of the assistants to the chief superintendents at the Department of Education.<sup>17</sup> Provision has been made in The Education (Teachers' Salaries) Regulations, 1963, for special remuneration for principals of regional and central high schools,<sup>18</sup> who have been designated by the chief superintendents as supervising principals of the systems. These principals are required to spend not less than three hours per week in the supervision of schools which supply students to the regional and central high schools.

Further provision for instructional supervision within the regional and central high school systems has been made in The Education

---

<sup>16</sup>Regional high school is a school which has been established within an area and in a building separate from other schools for the express purpose of accommodating pupils in designated grades not lower than grade nine from any or all schools within a district or districts.

<sup>17</sup>Personal letter from R. L. Dawe, Superintendent of Education, Anglican Division, Department of Education, dated September 14, 1964.

<sup>18</sup>Central high school means a school which has been established within an area and in a building separate from other schools for the purpose of accommodating all pupils in designated grades not lower than grade seven.





(Teachers' Salaries) Regulations, 1963. Again, the Department of Education has recognized the need for supervision and provides financial assistance when supervisors are employed by local boards. Regulation 12 states that:

In every regional high school and central high school, where the aggregate enrollment of that school and of all schools supplying students to that school is not less than

- (a) two thousand, one salary unit;
- (b) five thousand, two salary units; or
- (c) nine thousand, three salary units

shall, on the request of the appropriate school board, be provided for supervisors at the school.

Recent figures indicate that there are twenty-seven regional high school systems and sixty-seven central high school systems operating in the province.<sup>19</sup> Many of these school systems have supervising principals who work with the principals and teachers of the feeder schools in the systems. However, it seems that under the present arrangement, supervising principals might be unable to devote sufficient time to the supervision of instruction, since they are usually responsible for classroom teaching in addition to their administrative duties. The minimum time required to be spent in supervisory activities, which was stated as three hours per week, suggests that the Department of Education has recognized the magnitude of the principals' responsibilities.

Local supervisors have been appointed by school boards in four regional high school districts and at present plans are being made for the appointment of several others.<sup>20</sup> Remuneration from the central

---

<sup>19</sup>Statistics supplied by J. Acreman, Assistant Superintendent, United Church Division, Department of Education, November 15, 1964.

<sup>20</sup>Personal letter from C. Roebathan, Assistant Superintendent, Anglican Division, Department of Education, September 10, 1964.



authority is applicable, as explained, to supervisors who are appointed by the boards of regional and central high school systems only. Should other school boards appoint supervisors of instruction, they would be solely responsible for the supervisors' salaries.

Although there are twenty-two provincial supervisory districts, only eighteen positions are occupied at the present time. Roebathan explains the present situation in these words:

For the past few years, we have been two or three supervisors short, usually because some of them are attending university or leave and are not immediately replaced. When a district is vacant, the superintendents have the right, I suppose, to send in another supervisor, although this is not usually done unless some problems arise.<sup>21</sup>

In the Annual Report of the Department of Education for the year ending March 31, 1963, it is stated that at no time since the school year 1953-54 has the supervisory staff been kept at full strength, although the prescribed number of supervisory districts has not been extended during this time.<sup>22</sup> An examination of the Annual Reports of the Department for a number of years, on the other hand, reveals that the school population has been growing rapidly and that the number of teachers employed has increased correspondingly. Thus the supervisor-teacher and supervisor-pupil ratios have decreased during the past two decades as shown in Table I. While the student enrollment in all schools of the province increased by 95 per cent between 1945 and 1963, and teaching and

---

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>Government of Newfoundland, Annual Report of the Department of Education, 1963, p. 16.





TABLE I

NUMBER OF SUPERVISING INSPECTORS IN RELATION TO TEACHERS AND PUPILS  
IN ALL NEWFOUNDLAND SCHOOLS SINCE 1944<sup>a</sup>

Year	Number of Super- vising Inspectors	Pupil Population	Number of Teachers	Pupils per Inspector	Teachers per Inspector
1944-45	12	69,737	1,950	5,811	163
1945-46	19	70,460	2,231	3,708	117
1947-48	19	72,940	2,408	3,839	127
1956-57	16	109,108	3,368	6,756	210.5
1959-60	17	124,867	4,019	7,345	236.4
1961-62	18	133,747	4,502	7,430	250.1
1962-63	18	137,700	4,789	7,650	266

<sup>a</sup>Compiled from the Annual Reports of the Department of Education.



administrative personnel increased by 114.7 per cent, the number of district supervising inspectors employed by the Department of Education decreased by 5.3 per cent. Although regional high school systems have grown in number and have been excluded from the supervising inspectors' responsibilities, and the level of teacher training has been raised, it is perplexing to see the development which has occurred with respect to the number of supervising inspectors employed.

During recent years, it has become mandatory for supervising inspectors to reside in their supervisory districts. Section 53 of The Education Act, 1960, specifically mentions this requirement. It seems that in the past supervising inspectors frequently resided in the more populous areas of the province where the conveniences of town and city facilities could be enjoyed. It was felt that the supervisor would be less closely associated with the way of life and the educational problems of his district while he could be classified as a commuter. Hence, in the interest of educational efficiency, the clause regarding place of residence was inserted in the Act.

### III. SUMMARY

The educational system of the province of Newfoundland is a comparatively complex one with five denominational school systems operating under the one central authority. The Council of Education, comprised of one representative from each of the five recognized religious denominations, the Deputy Minister and the Minister of Education, determines educational policy at the provincial level, although the



provincial government actually controls education. This system of education stemmed from the so-called voluntary schools of the early nineteenth century when schools were operated by religious and philanthropic societies.

Although the central authority exercises sufficient control over the schools to ensure that certain standards are achieved, local boards have a large measure of control in education. They are required to provide educational facilities to meet the needs of the people in the school districts; they must decide which administrators, teachers and other personnel are appointed to operate their schools and what educational programs are to be offered to the pupils who attend them. In these and other ways, boards are empowered with major responsibilities.

Within this framework, the supervising inspector exercises his functions under the direction of one of the five chief superintendents, depending upon the religious affiliation of the inspector and the religious denominations of the boards with which he is associated. The position arose out of the need for some accounting of state funds being spent on education and to provide assistance for local boards in making decisions of considerable import.

In 1843, one inspector was charged with the responsibility for visiting all schools established or supported by the state; however, by 1935 twelve inspectors had been appointed. At present, although there are twenty-two supervisory districts, only eighteen positions are occupied. While provision has been made for other supervisory personnel in regional and central high school systems, it is perplexing to





find that the provincial supervisory staff has not been increased in recent years, despite the fact that school populations have been rising rapidly and teaching and administrative staffs correspondingly.



## CHAPTER III

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE ON THE SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT

In this chapter the literature is reviewed with three general purposes in mind. The first is to establish the similarities and differences in the statutory provisions which govern the duties and responsibilities of school superintendents in Canada. The second purpose is to determine the views of authorities regarding the most appropriate training for the superintendency and the functions which they consider desirable for the incumbent of this position. The third purpose of this chapter is to review a selected number of related studies which may have some significance in a study of the school superintendent in Newfoundland.

#### I. STATUTORY PROVISIONS GOVERNING THE PROVINCIALY APPOINTED SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT IN CANADA

A comparison of the Education Acts of the provinces and the Regulations of the Lieutenant-Governors in Council with regard to the status of the provincially appointed superintendent or inspector reveals many similarities in the nature of the functions assigned to the superintendents in each of the provinces. In each instance, executive and supervisory functions are considered to be of primary importance. The superintendent is responsible for ensuring that the provisions of the school statutes and departmental regulations are enforced. With other



personnel, he is also required to engage in cooperative activities directed towards the improvement of instruction. In these respects, all superintendents have responsibilities for the educational efficiency of the schools.

From a legal standpoint, differences among superintendents' responsibilities and duties occur in the area of their relationships with school boards. In several provinces, the school superintendent is regarded as the educational advisor to the boards. The School Acts of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia emphasize the superintendent's advisory function in the formulation of school board policy. This function of the superintendent, although implied, is given less prominence in the School Acts of Newfoundland, Quebec and Prince Edward Island.

The Acts of British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan state that the superintendent should attend all school board meetings, and in British Columbia and Alberta the superintendent is required to assist the school board in the discharge of its duties and may, in practice, become the executive officer of the board. This latter function for the superintendent may be inferred from the Public Schools Act of Ontario.

It is clear that in all of the provinces the school superintendent is required to perform executive duties for the Department of Education and supervisory duties under the direction of the Department of Education or the local boards of education. In several provinces he is considered to be the educational advisor to the boards with which he is associated, while in others the advisory function is less pronounced.





The Acts of only two provinces require the superintendent to assist in the execution of school board policy.

Since the position of school superintendent is one involving educational leadership and service, it seems to be a difficult position to define accurately. Even with precise definition, the actual performance of this role will depend, to a large extent, upon the incumbent of the position, and the expectations of those with whom he is associated. Apart from ensuring that the provisions of the school law and regulations of the Department of Education are enforced, the legal authority of the superintendent must, of necessity, be limited if local government in education is to operate effectively.

## II. TRAINING FOR THE SUPERINTENDENCY

### Pre-Service Training

In the past, it was customary in Canada to require prospective school superintendents to have a broad general education and outstanding teaching success. Administrative experience as a school principal or as an assistant principal was also frequently required. In some instances, however, the academic qualifications attained by superintendents were lower than the educational achievements of some principals and teachers. Hencley's findings, in a study of the Alberta divisional and county superintendent, supported this point and led him to conclude that superintendents should probably possess both the leadership qualities, and the training necessary, to place them in a rank equal or superior to



those of the personnel whom they are appointed to supervise.<sup>1</sup> In a study of the preparation needs of superintendents in Saskatchewan, Ready concluded that superintendents who had received training for the teaching profession without specialized training for the superintendency were inadequately prepared for several task areas.<sup>2</sup>

The literature reveals that increasing attention is being given to the types of pre-service and in-service training most desirable for the school superintendent. There has been a trend towards the recognition of the necessity for having professionally trained personnel in this position. Learning the work of a superintendent by doing it is considered to be too much of a trial-and-error process. Since the various forms of competence required by the superintendent seem to be sufficiently known to be provided for in university programs, it is suggested in the literature that administrative training should be a requirement for the superintendent.

Preparation programs for school administrators were discussed by a panel at the Banff Regional Conference of School Administrators, held in April, 1959. At that time, Byrne made these points on the training needs of the provincial superintendent:

1. The superintendent must be trained and prepared to work in the field of personnel administration which includes that of supervision. The business of inter-personal relationships seems to be the most significant part of the superintendent's job. He should be knowledgeable in the fields of social psychology and sociology.

---

<sup>1</sup>S. P. Hencley, "A Descriptive Survey of the Alberta Divisional and County School Superintendent" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1958), p. 116.

<sup>2</sup>L. M. Ready, "The Preparation Needs of Superintendents in Large Administrative Units in Saskatchewan" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1961), p. 149.





2. The second aspect of his training should be a broad understanding and a shrewd perception of the school as a social institution. He needs to know a great deal about education including the history and background of the public system of education in Canada. He should have a well-thought-out, well conceived philosophy of education and should understand contemporary society. He should know a good deal about the discipline of psychology which provides him with insight into the way children learn.

3. There is certain technical knowledge and skill that the superintendent should possess. He should be knowledgeable in the field of public finance and economics, and in the structure of business in modern society. He needs to have an understanding of the principles of budget construction and should be knowledgeable about school buildings.

4. Having a specialty in education is important. It demonstrates that he is scholarly in his interests and that he is competent to the point of expertness in a particular discipline.<sup>3</sup>

Ready describes various approaches to the preparation of superintendents including the interdisciplinary approach, human relations training, the development of a theory of administration, and others. He concludes that ideal preparation would exhibit two qualities:

1. It would enable the superintendent to recognize the significant tasks which must be performed.

2. It would equip the superintendent with the theory, knowledge, and skill necessary for the competent performance of these significant tasks.<sup>4</sup>

Flower believes that Canadians can look forward to a greater emphasis on professional training for the superintendency, when qualifications for a superintendent's position will include certification based on graduate work beyond the master's level and embracing an

---

<sup>3</sup>Division of Educational Administration, Projects in Canadian School Administration (Edmonton: Division of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, 1959), pp. 30-36.

<sup>4</sup>Ready, op. cit., p. 57.





internship.<sup>5</sup> Referring to the preparation needs of the American superintendent, Reeves states that a school superintendent should be trained as a school administrator, preferably at the doctoral level, but as a minimum, to one year of graduate study represented by a master's degree. He points up the fact that the mere level of training, per se, is not the important thing, but training in administering a school system where supervision, personnel administration, business administration and physical plant administration are emphasized.<sup>6</sup>

According to Ross, the superintendent's job is becoming more demanding of high level professional training because of increased technology in classroom management, high public expectations of schools, and increased knowledge about school systems resulting from serious research.<sup>7</sup>

The present usual minimum qualifications for initial appointment as a superintendent in Canada, according to Flower, include certification as a teacher, and successful teaching experience plus experience in an administrative capacity. A graduate degree is customary in most provinces while two provinces require graduate study in school law and

---

<sup>5</sup>G. E. Flower, "Professional Growth of the Superintendent," The Canadian Superintendent, R. H. Wallace (editor) (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1959), p. 61.

<sup>6</sup>C. E. Reeves, School Boards--Their Status, Functions and Activities (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954), p. 240.

<sup>7</sup>D. H. Ross, Some Arguments for Requiring a More Rigorous Preparation for Chief School Administrators (Albany, N.Y.: The Co-operative Development of Public School Administration, Administrative Center, State Education Department, 1954), p. 23.



supervision.<sup>8</sup>

### In-Service Training

The literature not only reveals the importance of adequate pre-service administrative training for the superintendent but also emphasizes in-service training requirements. The thirtieth yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, The American School Superintendency, stresses the significance of in-service training in this way:

A member of a profession has only begun preparation for his work when he completes the prescribed pre-service professional education. New insights, knowledge and skills are continually evolving in all professions as a result of research and practice. Only by constant study can he keep abreast of these new developments. If he fails to use them, the quality of his work will drop below the standards which a professional worker is expected to maintain.<sup>9</sup>

The American Association of School Administrators lists eleven devices for in-service growth, among which are included: informal, non structured organizations, research participation, public speaking, learning from teachers and other colleagues, cultural activities, university teaching, university offerings and independent professional reading. It concludes with the assertion that independent professional reading remains the chief in-service resource for the school administrator.<sup>10</sup> Moore

---

<sup>8</sup>Flower, op. cit., pp. 58-59.

<sup>9</sup>American Association of School Administrators, Thirtieth Yearbook, The American School Superintendency (Washington 6, D.C.: National Education Association, 1952), p. 410.

<sup>10</sup>American Association of School Administrators, Professional Administrators for America's Schools, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1960), pp. 92-99.





describes some of the new approaches to the in-service education of school administrators resulting from the CPEA movement. These include an in-service technique called intervisitation where school administrators visit other school systems and compare practices; a "clinic" approach using one school system for an evaluation of practices; workshops and conferences built around case studies; changes in conference procedures using such techniques as role-playing demonstrations; and group research projects.<sup>11</sup> Flower reports on a C.E.A. survey of superintendents' in-service activities in Canada, which revealed that numerous conferences, conventions and other in-service activities are forming part of the training program.<sup>12</sup>

#### Qualifications for the Superintendency

The literature indicates that specific administrative training is desirable for the school superintendent and that superintendents should probably possess a graduate degree. At the present time a graduate degree is becoming customary for the position in Canada. In addition to this level of formal training, an active in-service training program is also necessary if school administrators are to benefit from new developments in their field.

---

<sup>11</sup>H. A. Moore, Jr., Studies in School Administration (Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1957), pp. 99-100.

<sup>12</sup>Flower, op. cit., p. 60.





### III. ORGANIZATION FOR EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION

#### Executive Status of Provincially Appointed Superintendent

The duties and responsibilities of the school superintendent are determined by legislative enactment, school board policy, professional opinion, the nature of the administrator himself and local tradition. As a line officer of the Department of Education, the superintendent is free to pursue his executive duties for the Department acting within the authority of his position. His leadership role, however, is less clearly defined and some variance exists among the provinces in the statutory provisions governing his responsibilities for educational leadership. In spite of the indeterminate standing of the superintendent in law, and the differences in statutory provisions governing his duties and responsibilities in the various provinces, writers seem to be in agreement on the functions which should be encompassed in the superintendent's position.

Authorities contend that there is an increasing need for professional execution of local educational policies. Since the effectiveness of a school system depends on the extent to which educational goals are being reached, the emphasis that is being placed upon professional knowledge in executing school board policy may well be overdue.

School boards must comply with the educational requirements of the central authority to ensure that minimum standards are attained and they must meet the educational requirements of the area which they serve. Since school boards generally exercise considerable responsibility for



educational efficiency in their local areas, the administrative structure desirable for efficient and effective operation of local boards has received a good deal of attention in the literature.

Lorimer contends that the fundamental need of a school system is an administrative structure that facilitates effective instruction in the classroom. He feels that such diverse activities as engaging teachers, planning and maintaining an adequate physical plant, procuring sufficient and satisfactory supplies, organizing an efficient transportation system, and developing an effective educational program require the services of an executive officer who is an educator.<sup>13</sup>

Flower and Stewart compare the functions of the superintendent of the past to the service function of the superintendent today and state that the superintendent is something of both policy-maker and executive; policy-maker in that he advises the board on effective policies and executive in the sense that he takes much of the responsibility for executing them.<sup>14</sup> Sharp contends that the duties of a school board resemble those of an industrial board of directors. He suggests that the function of the local board should be chiefly policy-making like the board of directors of an industrial organization. If the board assumes executive functions, rather than delegating them to an executive, the

---

<sup>13</sup>W. C. Lorimer, "Administration for Effective Education," The Canadian Superintendent, R. H. Wallace (editor) (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1959), p. 54.

<sup>14</sup>G. E. Flower and F. K. Stewart, Leadership in Action: The Superintendent of Schools in Canada (Toronto: W. J. Gage Ltd., 1958), Introduction, xiv.





administrative system is likely to be less effective.<sup>15</sup> A survey report on school administration in the County of Sturgeon, Alberta, suggests that the school committee re-define its functions so as to place major emphasis on policy-making and appraisal of school operation by giving greater executive responsibility to the provincial superintendent as well as to other administrative officers.<sup>16</sup> Ideally, it seems that school boards should concentrate their efforts in the formulation of educational policies and should delegate executive functions to their superintendents and staffs.

Although American literature on the school superintendency refers to locally appointed superintendents, it is felt that much of what has been written can be equally applicable to provincially appointed superintendents. Writing on the American superintendency, Hagman states that the history of education in the United States records a sufficient number of serious cases of board interference with school operations which were professional in nature to establish the principle that lay interference in executive functions is undesirable.<sup>17</sup> Grieder, Pierce and Rosenstengel point out that the school board should plan, legislate,

---

<sup>15</sup>R. F. Sharp, "Making the Administrative System Work," Leadership in Action: The Superintendent of Schools in Canada (Toronto: W. J. Gage Ltd., 1958), p. 144.

<sup>16</sup>The Division of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, Administration in the County of Sturgeon #15 (Edmonton: Division of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, 1962), p. 17.

<sup>17</sup>H. L. Hagman, The Administration of the American Public Schools (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1951), p. 109.





evaluate, interpret and occasionally sit in a judicial capacity, but that the superintendent should execute. They further state that since legislation guides administration, those who legislate must know what administration requires for its support, and administration must be guided by legislation; hence a reciprocal relationship is required.<sup>18</sup>

Very often school boards have been apprehensive in relinquishing administrative control to the school superintendent. The American Association of School Administrators uses these words to describe such apprehension:

Unfortunately, in some of the smallest districts--districts that are far too small to be organized as independent school systems--the board tends to assume the executive function, especially with respect to purchasing, budget preparation, and business, and to relegate to the superintendent only the co-ordination and supervision of instruction.<sup>19</sup>

Engelhardt, describing the American superintendency some thirty years ago, claimed that the relationships which then existed between the school superintendent and the local board of education were the results of many years of conscious development, since school boards very slowly and apprehensively relinquished administrative control in spite of attempts by educational leaders to improve school management.<sup>20</sup>

Finlay found that school boards in Alberta expected superintendents

---

<sup>18</sup>C. Grieder, T. M. Pierce, and W. E. Rosenstengel, Public School Administration (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1961), p. 126.

<sup>19</sup>American Association of School Administrators, The American School Superintendency (Washington 6, D.C.; National Education Association, 1952), p. 101.

<sup>20</sup>F. Engelhardt, Public School Organization and Administration (New York: Ginn and Co., 1931), p. 84.



to act as executive officers of the boards in the areas of instructional leadership, selection and management of professional personnel, and to some extent in the management of pupil personnel; however, in several task areas, boards themselves, preferred to act as the administrators, especially in the area of finance.<sup>21</sup> Hencley also found that school boards in Alberta were actively engaging superintendents in executive duties. He concluded that boards are accepting the idea that time and professional knowledge are necessary in activating educational plans and policies.<sup>22</sup>

### Unitary Leadership

It is suggested in the literature that the principle of unitary leadership should be observed in large units of administration, where business administrators and other personnel are employed by boards of education. That one executive officer should be directly responsible to the board for all phases of school operation is expressed by Sharp in these words:

It is generally recognized by educational authorities that an organization operates most successfully under one head. It matters not whether that head be called a director, a superintendent, or an inspector. Where more than one executive official is directly responsible to the board, that body must assume the task of co-ordinating the activities of its executive officers.<sup>23</sup>

Flower supports the principle of unitary leadership whereby an

---

<sup>21</sup>J. H. Finlay, "Expectations of School Boards for the Role of the Provincially Appointed Superintendent of Schools in Alberta" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1961), p. 105.

<sup>22</sup>Hencley, op. cit., p. 114.      <sup>23</sup>Sharp, op. cit., p. 145.





organization has a chief executive officer. He says, "Centralized control and responsibility within an organization is widely accepted in theory and practice as a first principle of efficient management."<sup>24</sup> In a multiple executive organization, with two or more co-ordinate officials, each responsible to the board, there is the possibility of conflict, or a lack of congruence in expectations, developing in their relationships. Matson concluded that there was considerable conflict in the executive function of superintendents and secretary-treasurers in the large school units of Alberta.<sup>25</sup>

Authorities regard the execution or implementation of school board policy as being essentially professional in nature and a primary function of the school superintendent. School boards should perform their legislative functions but should delegate executive functions, where possible, to the provincially appointed school administrator.

#### IV. THE PROVINCIALY APPOINTED SUPERINTENDENT AND EDUCATIONAL POLICY

##### The Superintendent as a Professional Advisor

A number of treatises, which are to be examined in this discussion on theory and practice in superintendent-board relationships and superintendent-department of education relationships, stress giving

---

<sup>24</sup>G. E. Flower, "School Administration Has Come of Age," School Progress, XVII (April-May, 1958), 33.

<sup>25</sup>O. L. Matson, "Conflict in the Executive Function of the Administration of the Large School Units of Alberta" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1964), pp. 74-80.





advice on educational policies as a primary and continuing function of the superintendent. The potential role of the superintendent as a policy-maker has probably been obscured in practice by the focus of attention on the department of education and boards of education as instrumental in determining educational policy. Since it is impossible to define policy in such a manner as to make it applicable in every situation, a place is left for individuality and originality on the part of the superintendent in policy implementation. The superintendent's potential role in policy-making, however, should not be under-emphasized. Peterson quotes Flower on this point in these words:

The nub of the matter, it seems to me, is that the superintendent or inspector, or whatever he may be called, is a full-time professional educator with a leadership role to perform. He must, of course, carry out policies laid down by the Department or the local board, but surely, as a full-time professional leader, he has a responsibility to influence the formation of these policies to the best of his abilities. If he does not see needs, who will? Assuming that he does see and that he does know, to what end if he does not say so by way of advice to the policy-makers?<sup>26</sup>

Citing H. B. Brown, Peterson continues:

Formulation of local educational policy is a three-way proposition including the board, the superintendent and the principals with their staffs. Policy proposals, whether they be for new features or adaptations of existing ones may, and should, arise from any of these three sources. Furthermore, the final shaping and adoption of policy should only be arrived at after consultation with and pooling of the considered judgement of all three principal agents who will be responsible for its successful implementation. In practice, it generally happens that more frequently than not policy proposals will originate with the superintendent.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>E. G. Peterson, "The Superintendent and Educational Policy," The Canadian Superintendent (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1959), p. 22.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 25.



Referring to the leadership role of the school superintendent, Goldring states his views in this way:

In addition to instruction, it is the superintendent's major responsibility to plan and administer education in the area, so that as far as possible all children will receive adequate education in accordance with modern concepts of growth, development, and instructional policies. Inevitably, he is required to give advice and information to his board and to the public at large.<sup>28</sup>

Elliott, while suggesting that the superintendent employed by one board would probably operate with greater authority, nevertheless feels that the provincially appointed inspector must work as an advisor and leader to his boards.<sup>29</sup>

Writing on the American superintendency, Grieder, Pierce and Rosenstengel, in attempting to point up the strategic position of the superintendent as a policy-maker, emphasize the professional assistance which he can render in this way:

It is perfectly correct for the superintendent to participate in policy-making and, in fact, this should be expected of him because of his special knowledge and preparation. . . . A board has authority, of course, to formulate policies and pass motions to give policies effect on its own initiative, by-passing the superintendent. This should not occur since it nullifies the potential contribution that the administrator is or should be qualified to make.<sup>30</sup>

The twenty-fourth yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators supports this view in these words:

---

<sup>28</sup>C. C. Goldring, "The Superintendent of Schools as a Local Leader," Leadership in Action, edited by Flower and Stewart (Toronto: W. J. Gage, Ltd., 1958), pp. 90-91.

<sup>29</sup>C. M. Elliott, "The Superintendent's Work With Groups," The Canadian Superintendent, R. H. Wallace (editor) (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1959), p. 37.

<sup>30</sup>Grieder, Pierce and Rosenstengel, op. cit., p. 143.





In all properly organized and operated school systems the board receives professional advice from the superintendent in connection with its legislative functions. The board holds final power on all legislative decisions, but in practice most suggestions for policies to be adopted are likely to come from the superintendent. . . .The superintendent of schools is prepared not only to give counsel to the board on policies initiated by the board, or on the revision of policies previously established, but he is trained for proposing policies on his own initiative.<sup>31</sup>

There seems to be general agreement among educators and others that the superintendent or inspector has a vital part to play in the formulation of local educational policy; however, there is evidence to indicate that at least in some areas of Canada this function is being performed inadequately. Describing the leadership role of the school inspector in Ontario, Simpson summarized the situation of rural areas as follows:

The department inspector's relationships with school boards and trustees at the present time is fraught with frustrations resulting from the inherent weakness in the small district system of administration. Because the power of such small unit boards if unwisely used can upset the best plans of other educational leaders, the department inspector must attempt to give more positive leadership than that provided by the occasional visit at the time of school inspection or during consideration of special problems.<sup>32</sup>

#### Reluctance of Boards to Solicit Advice

Although school boards have the right to expect educational leadership from the superintendent, the danger exists that they may

---

<sup>31</sup>American Association of School Administrators, School Boards in Action, Twenty-Fourth Yearbook (Washington 6, D.C.: National Education Association, 1946), pp. 52-53.

<sup>32</sup>D. W. Simpson, "The Leadership Role of the County Inspector," Leadership for the Improvement of Instruction, Thirteenth Yearbook of the Ontario School Inspectors' Association (Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Company, 1957), p. 26.





ignore the potential professional guidance available. Althouse stated that because of the danger of ignoring the superintendent in settling policy at the local and provincial levels, the C.E.A.-Kellogg Project focussed its attention not only on training superintendents to think clearly about educational policy, but also on creating an awareness by Ministers of Education and members of school boards of the professional advice which can be rendered by superintendents.<sup>33</sup> In this respect, a study by Roebathan of Anglican school boards in Newfoundland revealed that only thirty per cent of the boards surveyed mentioned the supervising inspector as a source of professional guidance.<sup>34</sup> On the other hand, Finlay's study of the expectations of school board members for the provincially appointed school superintendent in Alberta showed that boards expect the superintendent to be actively involved in the performance of several of their administrative tasks and to act in an advisory capacity for several others.<sup>35</sup>

The literature suggests that since the welfare of education depends upon the soundness of policies adopted at the provincial and local levels, it is essential that professional knowledge should be available and utilized in determining policies. The superintendent or inspector should provide the professional assistance required.

---

<sup>33</sup>J. G. Althouse, "The Inspector of Schools, Executive and Policy-Maker," Leadership for the Improvement of Instruction, Thirteenth Yearbook, Ontario School Inspectors' Association (Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Company, 1957), p. 5.

<sup>34</sup>C. W. Roebathan, "A Study of the Operation of Anglican School Boards in Newfoundland," (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1962), p. 105.

<sup>35</sup>Finlay, op. cit., pp. 101-102.



## V. THE PROVINCIALY APPOINTED SUPERINTENDENT AND THE SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION

Supervision of instruction is emphasized in the literature as an essential function in organizing for effective educational administration. McNerney states that a definite program for the supervision of the educational process is necessary if the educational personnel in a system are to function effectively.<sup>36</sup> Grieder, Pierce and Rosenstengel emphasize the fact that since the basic function of school systems is to provide programs of instruction, through which educational purposes can be realized, such services as buildings, supplies and equipment are secondary to effective teaching and to an effective instructional program, both of which are interdependent.<sup>37</sup>

### Nature of Instructional Supervision

Supervision has gone through evolutionary stages during the past half century. Byrne states that during the first two decades of this century, emphasis was on control, and supervision was regarded as a regulatory function. Teacher improvement followed as the main purpose of supervision, and finally emphasis was placed on the improvement of the total learning situation.<sup>38</sup> Boulanger contrasts the older and

---

<sup>36</sup>C. T. McNerney, Educational Supervision (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1951), p. 8.

<sup>37</sup>Grieder, et al, op. cit., p. 261.

<sup>38</sup>T. C. Byrne, "Supervision as Curriculum Development," Canadian Education, XII (September, 1957), 40.





newer approaches to instructional supervision in this way:

The old narrow idea of supervision under the form of visits which were too brief, of obsequious and old fashioned ceremonial, haphazard conferences, opinions imposed on the teacher by authority, has had its day. The new idea about inspection resides in the study and analysis of the whole teaching situation and knowledge acquired by the pupil, all conditioned by the needs of the environment and according to an appropriate program in which the inspector participates, a stimulus rather than a constraint.<sup>39</sup>

The new approach to supervision is stated very descriptively in a report of the C.E.A. Short Course in these words:

Traditionally, supervision has been inspectoral in nature and limited in scope to classroom activities. More recently, however, the emphasis has shifted from the teacher to the teaching process and to the pupil; from inspection and teacher rating to leadership and to evaluation of the whole learning situation; from the incidents of the classroom to all those factors both in school and out that might affect the learning situation, and from the giving of a few specialized techniques, to helping teachers to identify, to isolate, to analyze, and to solve their problems.<sup>40</sup>

In more recent years, the tendency has been for supervision to become a co-operative enterprise where supervisors and teachers work together to evaluate their contribution to pupil education.

### Need for Supervision

There is a continuous need for instructional supervision even when the level of teaching has been raised to a fairly high standard. Reeder contends that supervision as a compensation for inadequate training is but one valid argument for its use. Since pedagogical

---

<sup>39</sup>T. Boulanger, "The Changing Role of the School Inspector," Leadership in Action: The Superintendent of Schools in Canada (Toronto: W. J. Gage Limited, 1958), p. 132.

<sup>40</sup>Canadian Education Association, Report of the 1954 Short Course: Educational Leadership in the Superintendency (Toronto: 1954), p. 38.





theory and instructional practice are in a period of rapid change, and since a need exists for experimentation, he feels that supervision should be a continuous process.<sup>41</sup> A C.E.A. Short Course report listed the following purposes of supervision:

1. The improvement of instruction and learning;
2. The growth of the professional status of the teacher;
3. The co-ordination of the total instructional effort of all teachers within the school systems;
4. The co-ordination of educational experiences in the school, the home and the community;
5. The provision of a learning environment in keeping with the educational philosophy and the instructional practices employed;
6. The provision of educational leadership as a continuing feature of educational service.<sup>42</sup>

The need for supervision, however, is probably more pronounced in rural schools than in urban schools since ineffective teaching is probably more characteristic of the small school. The National Education Association Research Bulletin lists these important factors contributing to ineffective teaching in rural areas: insufficient teacher preparation and experience; teachers who cling to outworn, obsolete procedures; salaries so low that satisfactory work cannot be expected; lack of professional attitude on the part of teachers and rapid teacher turnover in rural schools.<sup>43</sup> Malmberg quotes a study carried out by Noll in South Dakota in which he found that there were many rural teachers with less than one year of academic preparation and that there was an annual

---

<sup>41</sup>E. H. Reeder, Supervision in the Elementary School (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1953), pp. 29-35.

<sup>42</sup>Canadian Education Association, op. cit., pp. 39-42.

<sup>43</sup>National Education Association, Research Bulletin, "Progress in Rural Education," XVIII (September, 1940), 167.



turnover of 21 per cent among rural teachers as contrasted with 9.5 per cent for town and city teachers.<sup>44</sup> Jacobson, Reavis and Logsdon quote studies which support those findings. They stress the urgent need for adequate supervisory practices in the rural school.<sup>45</sup>

Teachers sometimes have a greater potential than they use. Many factors prevent them from utilizing all of their skills and abilities, including lack of vision, past experience, community pressure, lack of adjustment in human relations and an inability to evaluate their work. Supervision can help to release their potentials and improve their educational accomplishments.

#### The Superintendent's Responsibilities for Supervision

Instructional supervision is regarded by authorities as the most important function of the incumbent of the superintendency, since it is the most direct means of facilitating the teaching-learning situation, towards which, all aspects of the administrative process are directed. Riddell states that it is very easy for the superintendent or inspector to become so involved in detail, with added duties, that the larger and more significant issues are passed over and little time remains for the improvement of teaching and program development.<sup>46</sup> A C.E.A. Short

---

<sup>44</sup>Harvey Malmberg, "The Principal as a Supervisor of Instruction in the Regional High School Districts of New Brunswick" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1959), p. 11.

<sup>45</sup>P. B. Jacobson, W. C. Reavis and J. D. Logsdon, Duties of School Principals, 2nd edition (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951), p. 489.

<sup>46</sup>R. A. Riddell, "The Supervising Official and Improvement in Teaching," Leadership for the Improvement of Instruction, Thirteenth Yearbook, Ontario School Inspectors' Association (Toronto: Copp Clark Co., 1957), p. 20.





Course report on the superintendency suggests that while the superintendent is mainly responsible for supervisory activities in the small school, he can do a great deal to promote the professional growth of the principal and should delegate various supervisory responsibilities to him. In larger schools, principals should assume major responsibilities for the supervisory program; however, the superintendent should direct this undertaking by developing a desire to supervise by the principal, by securing adequate supervisory time for the principal through persuading the board of the need, and by assisting the principal in working out the supervisory program.<sup>47</sup>

Writing on the American superintendency, Grieder, Pierce and Rosenstengel state that the superintendent of schools is the official director of instruction and must assume leadership in this area. Although he may delegate certain responsibilities to other personnel, he is still held accountable for the instructional program.<sup>48</sup> The American Association of School Administrators regards the function of instructional supervision as being of paramount importance for the school superintendent.<sup>49</sup> Schmidt states that in the small school the responsibility for supervision rests solely with the superintendent. He states his views in this way:

It is the responsibility of the superintendent to hold group teachers' meetings with both secondary and elementary teachers

---

<sup>47</sup>Canadian Education Association, op. cit., pp. 30-48.

<sup>48</sup>Grieder, et al, op. cit., p. 265.

<sup>49</sup>American Association of School Administrators, The American School Superintendency, Thirtieth Yearbook (Washington 6, D.C.: National Education Association, 1952), p. 226.





participating and with either group alone when the situation warrants such a division; to seek the aid of teachers in locating and solving instructional problems; to give special attention to inexperienced teachers by more personal conferences; to follow a planned program of supervision during the school year and to encourage teachers to experiment with new teaching methods.<sup>50</sup>

He apparently recognizes the fact that the training of the small school principal and the time available for instructional supervision are both of a limited nature.

While the superintendent may delegate certain supervisory responsibilities to others, instructional supervision is considered to be one of his primary functions. Young puts it this way: "If we are to be worthy of the place we hold, we must do the jobs in the order of their importance. Certainly neglect of the supervisory program is unjustifiable from any approach."<sup>51</sup>

#### Time Devoted to Supervision

There seems to be sufficient evidence available, as a result of several formal studies, to conclude that instructional supervision has received inadequate attention in some areas of Canada and the United States in the past. In 1946, Miller conducted a Canada-wide study of supervision for the purpose of determining the optimum load for supervisors of each type. The study showed considerable differences among the provinces in supervisory loads and generally too little time for the

---

<sup>50</sup>Ralph L. W. Schmidt, "Supervisory Responsibilities of the Superintendent in Elementary Grades of Small School Systems," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXIX (January, 1953), 33-34.

<sup>51</sup>C. M. Young, "From a Superintendent to Superintendents," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXI (March, 1945), 180.



prescribed duties. The assumption of extra administrative duties seemed to encroach upon the supervisors' time to such an extent that the function of instructional supervision could not be performed as effectively as it had been previously.<sup>52</sup> Hencley supported the latter finding in his study of the Alberta superintendent.<sup>53</sup> A ten per cent sample of western superintendents and principals in the United States, taken by the Midwest Administration Center, were asked on what problems in educational administration they felt the greatest need for help. More than thirty-five per cent indicated that they felt the greatest need for assistance in the area of instructional supervision.<sup>54</sup>

A report on the findings of the School Executive Studies, a research program initiated at Harvard University in 1952, describes a series of interviews with fifty per cent of the school superintendents in Massachusetts and their school board members concerning educational problems which both encounter in their respective positions. Over half of the superintendents felt that most of their time should be devoted to the direction of the instructional program. Less than one-fourth of them, however, were doing so. A major factor preventing those superintendents from concentrating on what they felt were priority functions

---

<sup>52</sup>S. A. Miller, "A Comparative Study of Supervision in the Various Canadian Provinces, with a View to Determining the Optimum Load for Supervisors of Each Type" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1946).

<sup>53</sup>Hencley, op. cit., p. 53.

<sup>54</sup>Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, "What About Improving Instruction?" Administrator's Notebook, V (January, 1957), 1-4.





was the amount of time they were forced to spend on menial and trivial tasks.<sup>55</sup>

The literature indicates that because of a supervisory load which is often too heavy in the first place, and because of the assumption of additional administrative tasks, superintendents are often unable to give the educational leadership in the area of instructional supervision which they and others consider necessary. Gross suggests that in many instances, menial and trivial tasks should be delegated to subordinates, leaving the superintendent free to engage in the more important aspects of educational administration.<sup>56</sup>

## VI. RELATED STUDIES

The studies conducted on the various aspects of the school superintendency are fairly numerous. In this section an attempt is made to review a selected number only. The selected group, it is felt, have findings which may have some significance in a study of the school superintendent in Newfoundland.

Ready conducted a study on the preparation needs of superintendents in large administrative units in Saskatchewan. The basic hypothesis in this study was that the preparation of Saskatchewan superintendents was in many respects, inadequate. He hypothesized that the pre-service and in-service preparation of the superintendents was

---

<sup>55</sup>Neal Gross, Who Runs Our Schools? (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958), p. 16.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., p. 140.





inadequate in preparing them to perform tasks which they recognized and that inadequate preparation was responsible for the non-recognition of tasks. The data to identify significant tasks were obtained from the superintendents, selected officials and the literature related to the tasks of the superintendency. Three sources provided the data used in determining the adequacy of preparation, namely, university transcripts, opinions of superintendents, and literature related to ideal preparation. His conclusions showed that Saskatchewan superintendents had received training for the teaching profession rather than specialized training for the superintendency and were inadequately prepared for their tasks.<sup>57</sup>

A study of the profile of the American school superintendent was made by the American Association of School Administrators and the Research Division of the National Education Association in 1960. The sample comprised thirty-six per cent of all urban superintendents in the United States. It was found that 95.6 per cent of all superintendents in the sample held advanced degrees; 21.7 per cent held a doctorate and 56.3 per cent held a master's degree; 60 hours beyond the bachelor's degree was the highest attainment of only 17.6 per cent. In the smallest urban districts, 95.1 per cent of all superintendents held an advanced degree. Superintendents were asked to rate the quality of their preparation on a scale to which point values were added later. All of the

---

<sup>57</sup>L. M. Ready, "The Preparation Needs of Superintendents in Large Administrative Units in Saskatchewan" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1961).



superintendents were satisfied with the quality of the preparation which they had received.<sup>58</sup>

The role of Canadian school superintendents has been subjected to several investigations which have revealed significant findings for the present study. Hencley made a descriptive survey of the status of the Alberta divisional and county school superintendent. He determined the factors which affected the selection of the superintendent and the legal status of the incumbent of this position, as well as the academic and professional background of the incumbent. An analysis was made of the tasks performed by the superintendent and the opinions and viewpoints of the superintendent with respect to the tasks performed were assessed. Among his conclusions, he stated that school boards of Alberta were recognizing the significance of expert professional advice in formulating policies and of professional knowledge in activating plans and policies.<sup>59</sup> Finlay's study, which has been already mentioned also, supported Hencley's findings with respect to school board expectations for the provincially appointed school superintendent.<sup>60</sup>

Collins undertook a major investigation of the role of the provincially appointed superintendent in the larger units of administration in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. His purposes were to establish the legal role of the

---

<sup>58</sup>American Association of School Administrators and the Research Division of the National Education Association, Profile of the School Superintendent (Washington 6, D.C.: National Education Association, 1960).

<sup>59</sup>Hencley, op. cit.

<sup>60</sup>Finlay, op. cit.





superintendent and to determine to what extent the expectations for the role were similar and different in the various provinces; to determine the actual role of the superintendent as seen by himself and the relationships between the de jure and de facto roles of the superintendent. Among other conclusions, he stated that the professional expectations for the superintendent, from a legal standpoint, were similar in all provinces. In the actual role of the superintendent, conflict existed between de jure expectations and de facto behaviour, since the superintendent regarded himself as a line and staff officer for both the Department of Education and the school board, whereas legally, the superintendent was expected to act as a line officer for the department and as a staff officer for the board.<sup>61</sup>

Roebathan's study of the operation of Anglican school boards in Newfoundland has special significance for the present study. It was hypothesized that Newfoundland school boards were delegated as much responsibility and control as could be expected but that many boards did not exercise all of this control because of inefficient organization. The conclusions revealed that although school boards were delegated sufficient control of education for effective local government, very little discretionary authority was exercised by the boards. Boards were overcrowded with members who had very little formal education and who were incapable of planning, organizing and administering education

---

<sup>61</sup>C. P. Collins, "The Role of the Provincially Appointed Superintendent of Schools in Larger Units of Administration in Canada" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1958).





without expert professional assistance.<sup>62</sup>

## VII. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER III

Although the Education Acts of the various provinces reveal striking similarities in executive and supervisory functions assigned to the provincially appointed superintendents, differences in responsibilities occur in the area of the superintendents' relationships with school boards. In several provinces, the advisory function is less pronounced than in others, and in two provinces only do the Acts specifically require that superintendents assist in the execution of school board policies.

The literature on the school superintendency stresses the importance of high level pre-service professional training for this position in all aspects of administration, including supervision, personnel administration, business administration and physical plant administration. In-service training is also strongly recommended to ensure professional growth and development.

Authorities contend that since local boards have considerable responsibilities for the educational efficiency of their schools, there is a fundamental need for professional execution of school board policies, hence executive functions should be delegated to superintendents and to staffs, and boards should concentrate their efforts in policy-making and appraisal of school operations.

---

<sup>62</sup>Roebothan, op. cit.



The literature also stresses the importance of the advisory role of provincially appointed superintendents in their relationships with boards and the Departments of Education. Writers seem to be in general agreement that superintendents should play an active role in formulating educational policies, especially at the local level, where their professional knowledge might have a salutary effect upon the soundness of policies adopted. However, evidence exists to indicate that some local boards have been reluctant to solicit the professional advice which they need.

The provincially appointed superintendent has a major responsibility for instructional supervision which is considered in the literature to be his primary function. Authorities state that although they may delegate some responsibilities to principals in large school systems, superintendents are still accountable for instructional programs, and in small school systems they should take major responsibility when principals have neither the training nor the time to carry out a satisfactory supervisory program.

A number of related studies show that some school boards are actively involving provincially appointed superintendents in advisory and executive functions; however, in several areas of administration they prefer to retain the control themselves.





## CHAPTER IV

### LEGAL STATUS AND METHOD OF SELECTION OF SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

The purposes of this chapter are twofold. In the first part of the chapter, the legal status of the district supervising inspector is described. The procedure followed in the selection of supervising inspectors and the qualifications required for appointment to the position are established in the second part of the chapter.

#### I. THE LEGAL STATUS OF THE SUPERVISING INSPECTOR

The legal status of the supervising inspector is defined in The Education Act, 1960, in which the various duties and responsibilities of the position are enumerated. These duties and responsibilities may be classified as regulatory, supervisory and, to some extent, advisory functions. As a civil servant, the inspector must interpret the Act and the Regulations of the Department of Education as both apply to educational matters in his supervisory district. His status as a civil servant precludes opposition by him publicly to educational policies determined at the provincial level, although he may voice his opinions on policy with Departmental authorities. Present legislation, as outlined in The Education Act, vests authority and responsibility for local educational matters in appointed school boards which operate in the districts to which supervising inspectors are assigned. While the inspector performs his regulatory and supervisory functions under the direction of the Department of Education, advisory and executive functions may be performed





under the direction of local boards of education.

### Specific Duties of the Supervising Inspector

The duties and responsibilities of the supervising inspector are defined in section 54 of The Education Act, 1960, as follows:

Every supervising inspector shall:

1. Visit every college and school in his district as often as possible during the year;
2. Ensure that the prescribed course of study is carried out in each college and school;
3. Assist teachers, especially those with limited training and experience, in the general planning and organization of their work, assist them to analyze and to evaluate the results of their work, make suggestions for improvement where appropriate, and see that proper standards of instruction are maintained;
4. Examine and report on the performance and methods of teachers, using report forms prescribed by the Department;
5. Give demonstration lessons, at his discretion;
6. Enquire into methods used in maintaining discipline, and advise and assist teachers, boards of directors and school boards in disciplinary problems;
7. Hold staff meetings in all schools with two or more classrooms;
8. Discuss with principals any weakness found in their schools;
9. Organize and conduct teachers' seminars in his district;
10. Report to the appropriate board of directors or school board when the duties of teachers as prescribed by the Act are not being carried out;
11. Certify all school annual returns from his district, note on them the number of legally authorized days taught by each teacher listed on the return and transmit the return to the proper chief superintendent;
12. Encourage boards of directors and school boards to establish school libraries, and where feasible, science, home economics, music, commercial and other services;
13. Inspect the provision made for school ventilation, heating, cleaning, sanitation and fire protection;
14. Report on the use of special government maintenance, library, home economics, commercial and other similar grants;
15. Audit the financial return of any school board when requested by the proper chief superintendent to do so;
16. Furnish school boards and teachers with information, when required, concerning the operation of the Act and the Regulations, and all other laws of the province relating to education;
17. Attend and otherwise encourage, in his area, group meetings convened in the interests of education, and attend school board meetings when requested to do so by the board;



18. Submit an annual report to the Deputy Minister of Education before the last day of December in each year; and
19. Carry out such other duties as may be assigned to him by the Deputy Minister of Education.

An analysis of the prescribed duties of the supervising inspector reveals that pronounced emphasis has been placed upon instructional supervision and the regulatory function of inspection. The supervisor's status as an advisor and an executive officer to boards is implied rather vaguely, if at all. The Act states that the inspector should attend school board meetings when requested to do so by boards and that he should advise the boards on disciplinary problems and encourage the establishment of various educational services. The inspector should also furnish information to boards concerning the operation of the Act. The service function of the supervising inspector in his relationships with boards seems to have received only minor attention. Apart from the constructive emphasis placed upon instructional supervision, attention seems to be directed primarily towards arresting unfavourable conditions resulting from school board administration.

It has been seen that the School Acts of several provinces regard the provincially appointed superintendent as an educational advisor to local boards and in a few instances the superintendent may become the executive officer of the local boards. These functions for the superintendent receive significance among other functions by two specific methods of emphasis. First, the superintendent's status as an advisor and potential executive officer is emphasized in the duties and responsibilities of the superintendent. Second, boards are encouraged in their duties to consult with the superintendent or inspector in all





matters pertaining to education, to consider his professional recommendations, and to delegate administrative duties to him. This type of emphasis on advisory and executive responsibilities seems to be omitted from The Education Act of Newfoundland, although there are some implications that the supervising inspector should perform a service function of a sort.

The potential relationships of the supervising inspector and local boards might also be affected by the performance of instructional supervision under the direction of the Department of Education and not under the direction of boards, as is customary in many provinces. The effect of the source of authority could very well be reflected unfavourably in the type of rapport experienced between the supervisor and boards of education. The significance of an active role for the superintendent in the formulation and execution of school board policy was discussed in the related literature, where it was clearly seen that the administration of an educational organization is the process of facilitating teaching and learning and of selecting and managing personnel and materials to implement the teaching and learning process. While the supervision of instruction is an important aspect of the total administrative process, effective instructional supervision alone will not ensure effective educational administration.

A close examination of The Education Act, 1960, shows that very few controlling powers are vested in the supervising inspector. Section 43, subsection 2, states that a school board may, at any time without notice, dismiss a teacher for incompetence, upon the certificate of a





supervising inspector; however, the authority of the supervising inspector is quite limited. Most of the controlling powers are reserved for the chief superintendents at the Department of Education. For example, unlike the custom in several provinces, the chief superintendents of the various denominational divisions act as official trustees in school systems when local boards become inoperative, and exercise the powers of boards until such time as new boards are appointed. This situation involves control which is removed from the local scene. In several administrative areas, local boards and their employees are responsible for duties with which provincial superintendents are sometimes charged. Approval of school promotions, suspensions of pupils, and exemptions of pupils from school attendance fall outside the jurisdiction of the supervising inspector. The absence of controlling powers within the position could conceivably have an unfavourable effect upon the status of the supervising inspector in his district and upon the extent to which local boards might accept educational leadership.

An examination of the duties of the supervising inspector as outlined in The Education Act has shown that the service function of the inspector in his relationships with boards is implied only vaguely, if at all. The lack of clarity with respect to the inspector's advisory and executive role and an absence of controlling powers within the position might militate against efficient and effective educational administration in the supervisory districts.



## II. SELECTION OF SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

The legal procedure to be used in the appointment of supervising inspectors is outlined in section 53 of The Education Act. This section reads as follows:

Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the Minister may appoint supervising inspectors who shall, as far as possible, be representative of the Anglican Church of Canada, the Roman Catholic Church, the United Church of Canada, the Salvation Army and the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland, and the duties of the supervising inspectors with regard to any religious denomination shall, as far as possible, be performed by such of the inspectors as are members of that denomination.

In practice, selection is usually made by one of the chief superintendents and the Deputy Minister, and the appointment is confirmed by the Minister and the Council of Education. Kirby explains the actual method of selection in these words:

Although supervisors are Civil Servants, the schools which each supervises are largely of his own denomination. The population distribution of the province makes it possible to carve out supervisory districts where the inhabitants are predominantly of one religious denomination. The supervising inspector in each district is of the religious denomination which is predominant in that district. Hence, selection is chiefly by one of the superintendents and the Deputy Minister. Before the appointment is confirmed, the Council of Education must approve.<sup>1</sup>

### Qualifications Required for Selection

Qualifications required for the position have been upgraded during the past years. Rowe states that the Education Act of 1920, which was the first legislation to approach inspection in a professional

---

<sup>1</sup>Letter from F. Kirby, Professional Assistant to the Deputy Minister of Education, August 12, 1964.





manner, required that supervising inspectors must have taught school for at least eight years and have held a first grade teaching certificate for at least six years; they were to fall within the twenty-five to fifty-five year age group and could not have been out of the teaching profession for more than three years. He observes that when the legislation was implemented in 1935, by the appointment of twelve supervisors, many possessed academic and professional qualifications which exceeded the prescribed minimum.<sup>2</sup> At the present time, minimum qualifications for the position include the possession of a university degree and candidates must have a number of years of successful teaching experience.<sup>3</sup> Neither administrative experience nor the specific degree considered desirable is mentioned in the specifications for the position.

Although the level of training required for appointment has been raised considerably, a number of factors seem to militate against an enthusiastic interest in the position by educators. Kirby states that the number of applicants for each position is often quite small, probably because of conditions of work and remuneration.<sup>4</sup>

Remuneration seems to be a factor which might contribute to the lack of enthusiasm for an appointment to this position. Supervising inspectors have generally been selected from principals with a number of years of successful teaching and administrative experience. At the present time, however, remuneration offered for principalships is

---

<sup>2</sup>F. W. Rowe, The History of Education in Newfoundland (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1952), p. 128.

<sup>3</sup>Kirby, loc. cit.      <sup>4</sup>Ibid.





greater than that available to supervising inspectors when candidates are academically and professionally well qualified. Supervising inspectors are classified as Directors, Grade V, which is one of the classifications of the Civil Service, with a salary scale ranging from \$5,830 - \$6,160 per annum, regardless of one's academic and professional qualifications.<sup>5</sup> Principals, on the other hand, are classified for salary purposes according to their academic and professional qualifications, experience, and the types of school systems in which they are employed. A principal with four years of university training having a major in education, in his tenth year of teaching or administration, and employed as a supervising principal of a regional or central high school system having twelve to seventeen classrooms receives a salary of \$6,744 minimum per annum, with possible augmentation from the local board. It should be emphasized that these academic qualifications are the minimum required for appointment to the supervisory service. A principal with six years of university training, with similar experience and employed in a similar position to the above, receives a salary of \$7,992.<sup>6</sup> A differential of approximately \$2,000 thus exists between a principal's salary and the salary of a supervising inspector when both hold a master's degree and have had ten years of teaching and administrative experience.

When the salaries of supervising inspectors were significantly

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>The Education (Teachers' Salaries) Regulations, 1963, Schedule--  
Part A and Part B.



higher than those of principals, it seems that very little difficulty was experienced in attracting personnel for the position. Rowe points out that in the nineteen thirties when supervisors' salaries were considerably higher than those of principals of the largest schools, some of the most highly qualified principals and teachers were drawn into the supervisory service.<sup>7</sup> At present, it would seem that unless the salaries of supervising inspectors are substantially raised, or unless candidates disregard financial loss, the most likely prospects for the position of supervising inspector will be younger men who have not had much teaching or administrative experience, men who have not completed very much advanced training and men who have not been administrators of large school systems. Reduction in salaries for these types of candidates would not be substantial and in some instances increases would result from the acceptance of an appointment.

### III. SUMMARY

The legal status of the supervising inspector is defined in The Education Act, 1960, in which the various duties and responsibilities of the position are outlined. An analysis of these duties and responsibilities revealed that pronounced emphasis has been placed upon instructional supervision and the regulatory function of inspection. The supervising inspector's status as an advisor and an executive officer to boards is not clearly defined, although there are some implications

---

<sup>7</sup>Rowe, loc. cit.





that the inspector should perform a service function of a sort.

The potential relationships of the inspector and school boards might also be unfavourably affected by the fact that instructional supervision is performed under the direction of the Department of Education and not under the direction of local boards, as is customary in many provinces.

An examination of The Education Act showed that very few controlling powers are vested in the supervising inspector. The absence of such powers could have an unfavourable effect upon the status of the inspector in his district and the extent to which leadership might be accepted by boards.

In practice, supervising inspectors are appointed by one of the chief superintendents and the Deputy Minister of Education, and appointments are confirmed by the Minister and the Council of Education. At the present time, minimum qualifications for the position include the possession of a university degree and candidates must have a number of years of successful teaching experience.

It seems that a lack of enthusiasm for appointment to the position exists among educators, probably because of conditions of work and remuneration. Remuneration offered for principalships is greater than that available to supervising inspectors when candidates are academically and professionally well qualified. It would seem that unless the salaries of supervising inspectors are raised, the most likely prospects for the position will be men who have not had much teaching or administrative experience and men who have not completed very much advanced training.



## CHAPTER V

### THE SETTING IN WHICH THE SUPERVISING INSPECTOR WORKS AND THE BACKGROUND OF THE INSPECTOR

The purpose of this chapter is to present a descriptive analysis of a portion of the information contained in the questionnaires returned by seventeen district supervising inspectors in Newfoundland. The information is presented in tabular form when that method of presentation is considered to be elucidative and the organization of the chapter follows that of the questionnaire.

#### I. SETTING

The first section of the questionnaire was designed to provide a picture of the potential educational responsibilities of supervising inspectors in Newfoundland and the context within which they function as educational leaders.

##### Supervisory Districts

The geographical areas within which supervising inspectors work, the supervisory districts, vary immensely in size. Data in Table II show the area in square miles included in the supervisory districts of sixteen of the inspectors who returned questionnaires. While the smallest district contains an area of eighty square miles, the supervising inspector in the largest district has educational responsibilities in an area of 5,600 square miles. The total area of the sixteen supervisory



TABLE II  
 AREA IN SQUARE MILES OF SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS

Area in Square Miles	Number of Supervisory Districts
5200 - 5699	1
4700 - 5199	1
4200 - 4699	0
3700 - 4199	0
3200 - 3699	0
2700 - 3199	0
2200 - 2699	1
1700 - 2199	2
1200 - 1699	0
1000 - 1199	0
800 - 999	2
600 - 799	0
400 - 599	1
200 - 399	2
0 - 199	6
Number of districts	16
Total area in square miles	20,465
Mean area in square miles	1,279





districts is 20,465 square miles. Three districts exceed 2,200 square miles in area, while six have an area of less than 200 square miles. The mean area for the sixteen districts is 1,279 square miles. Even in the smallest districts, maintaining close contact with schools and school boards could present a problem to supervising inspectors.

As in area, so in number of communities, a great gap exists between the supervisory district having the largest number, with sixty communities, and the district having the smallest number, with only thirteen. Eight of the supervising inspectors have districts encompassing more than thirty towns and villages, while only four have districts with less than twenty settlements. Seventeen inspectors, as revealed in Table III, have educational responsibilities in 547 separate communities. The mean number of communities with which the supervising inspector is associated is 32.2.

Because of a lack of industrialization, there are very few densely populated communities in the supervisory districts. Fishing, farming, and logging which were mentioned most frequently as being the primary sources of income in the districts, tend to restrict the size of towns and villages. Three hundred seventy-three, or 68.2 per cent, of the 547 communities have populations of less than five hundred people, while one hundred twenty-six communities have populations ranging from 501 to 1,000 people. Only forty-one communities with populations ranging from 1,001 to 5,000 were reported for the seventeen districts, and there are only seven communities with populations of more than 5,000. Supervisory districts encompass a large number of small towns and villages.



TABLE III

## NUMBER OF TOWNS AND VILLAGES IN SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS

Number of Towns and Villages	Number of Supervisory Districts
57 - 60	1
53 - 56	1
49 - 52	0
45 - 48	1
41 - 44	2
37 - 40	0
33 - 36	3
29 - 32	1
25 - 28	2
21 - 24	2
17 - 20	3
13 - 16	1
Number of districts	17
Total number of communities	547
Mean number of communities	32.2





Number and Total Enrollment of Schools

Unless school systems have been consolidated on an inter-community basis, it might be expected that the large number of small communities within the supervisory districts would encompass a relatively large number of schools. The total number of schools within sixteen of the seventeen supervisory districts described is 768, as shown in Table IV. Seven supervising inspectors are each responsible for more than fifty schools, and only one inspector has less than thirty schools under his surveillance. In one district there are seventy-four schools and in another seventy-two. The mean number of schools for all supervisory districts is forty-eight. The mean number of schools in each community within the supervisory districts is 1.49.

Further insight into the potential tasks of supervising inspectors may be provided by an examination of pupil enrollment in each supervisory district. The total student population for the sixteen districts is 73,004, as disclosed in Table V. Eight supervising inspectors have less than 3,300 pupils enrolled in their schools, while three have more than 5,000. In one district, there are more than 11,000 students in spite of the fact that the district has forty-seven schools. Another district has more than 8,000 pupils with sixty-one schools, many of which have not more than two rooms. Amongst those responsible for smaller enrollments, one supervisor is responsible for 2,600 pupils housed in twenty-five schools, and one for 2,700 pupils attending thirty-three schools. The mean enrollment for all districts is 4,562.75.



TABLE IV

## TOTAL NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN SIXTEEN SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Number of Schools	Number of Districts
73 - 76	1
69 - 72	1
65 - 68	1
61 - 64	1
57 - 60	1
53 - 56	2
49 - 52	0
45 - 48	2
41 - 44	0
37 - 40	2
33 - 36	3
29 - 32	1
25 - 28	1
Number of supervisory districts	16
Total number of schools	768
Mean number of schools	48

TABLE V

## PUPIL POPULATION OF SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS

Number of Pupils	Number of Districts
11,500 - 12,499	1
10,500 - 11,499	0
9,500 - 10,499	0
8,500 - 9,499	0
7,500 - 8,499	1
6,500 - 7,499	0
5,500 - 6,499	1
4,500 - 5,499	3
3,500 - 4,499	2
2,500 - 3,499	8
Number of supervisory districts	16
Total number of pupils	73,004
Mean number of pupils	4,562.75



### Sizes, Types and Religious Denominations of Schools

The sizes and types of schools in each supervisory district, as well as the total number, have implications for the potential educational responsibilities of supervising inspectors. In large school systems, principals are usually assigned a portion of their time to devote to the supervision of instruction in contrast to the small school system where they are often given full-time teaching assignments.

Small communities and the denominational system of education in Newfoundland have both contributed to the emergence of a multitude of small schools. These schools may be classified as all-grade schools; elementary schools which are responsible for grades below grade seven, and frequently grade nine; and high schools which are restricted to grades above grade six. Four hundred thirty of the 768 schools in sixteen districts, as shown in Table VI, are all-grade schools. These schools represent the five recognized religious denominations. Although, in some instances, two or more religious denominations have formed a common or amalgamated school, there is a preponderance of denominational schools among those in which all grades are taught. More than 30 per cent of these schools have only one room, and 62.3 per cent have not more than two rooms. Only 2.5 per cent have more than ten rooms.

A vast majority of the elementary schools also have not more than two rooms. According to Table VII, 203 of the 290 elementary schools, or 70 per cent, fall into this category. More than 40 per cent of the elementary schools have but one classroom and only 4.1 per cent have more than ten rooms. As with all-grade schools, these are distributed





TABLE VI

NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS AND RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS OF ALL-GRADE  
SCHOOLS (GRADES I-XI) IN SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS

Number of classrooms	Amalga- mated	Number of Schools					Joint		Total
		R.C.	Ang.	U.C.	S.A.	Pent.	Service	Other	
More than 10	2	5	3	--	1	--	--	--	11
6 - 10	6	10	8	10	7	4	2	--	47
5	1	6	6	1	--	--	2	--	16
4	4	9	7	3	2	6	2	--	33
3	3	11	20	11	6	3	1	--	55
2	1	26	38	46	14	13	2	1	141
1	0	24	57	36	3	4	--	3	127
Total	17	91	139	107	33	30	9	4	430

TABLE VII

NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS AND RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS OF ELEMENTARY  
SCHOOLS (GRADES I-VI-VIII) IN SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS

Number of classrooms	Amalga- mated	Number of Schools					Joint		Total
		R.C.	Ang.	U.C.	S.A.	Pent.	Service	Other	
More than 10	3	8	0	0	0	1	0		12
6 - 10	3	6	4	2	3	0	0		18
5	0	2	1	3	1	0	0		7
4	0	5	4	11	1	0	0		21
3	0	8	11	6	0	2	2		29
2	0	23	22	23	11	3	2		84
1	0	41	36	31	5	2	4		119
Total	6	93	78	76	21	8	8		290



among the five religious denominations.

Although a majority of the high schools are larger than either all-grade or elementary schools, these cannot be classified as large schools. As indicated in Table VIII, twenty-six, or 54.2 per cent, of the forty-eight high schools reported have not more than five classrooms. Only five high schools, or 10.4 per cent, have more than ten rooms.

More than 23 per cent of the total pupil population for the sixteen districts attend schools which have not more than two classrooms, and 44.2 per cent are enrolled in schools with less than five classrooms. Only 21.6 per cent of the total pupil population attend schools with more than ten rooms.

A comparison of the mean size of the two hundred Roman Catholic schools in the supervisory districts with the mean size of all other schools reveals that while the mean enrollment of Roman Catholic schools is one hundred twenty-one, all other schools have a mean enrollment of only 85.9. The mean difference in enrollment between the two groups of schools is consistently in favour of Roman Catholic schools at the elementary and high school levels. Protestant groups, together, operate a proportionately larger number of small schools than are operated under the Roman Catholic authority.

The large number of small schools within supervisory districts has significance for the supervising inspector as an instructional leader and points up a vital role for him in supervision, since the vast majority of principals, even if thoroughly qualified to participate in a supervisory program, are undoubtedly engaged in full or part-time teaching.





TABLE VIII

NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS AND RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS OF HIGH SCHOOLS  
IN SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS

Number of classrooms	Amalga- mated	Number of Schools					Total
		R.C.	Ang.	U.C.	S.A.	Pent.	
More than 10	1	3	0	1	0	0	5
6 - 10	4	5	4	3	0	1	17
5	1	3	8	0	0	0	12
4	1	1	2	1	2	1	8
3	0	4	1	0	0	0	5
2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	7	16	16	5	2	2	48



Number and Religious Denominations of School Boards

The number of school boards with which the supervising inspector is officially associated will have an effect upon the potential scope of his administrative activities. Supervising inspectors in Newfoundland are not assigned to one board but in every instance have responsibilities to several boards. As shown in Table IX, sixteen inspectors are officially assigned to 220 local boards of education. Although one inspector is associated with only four boards, two have relationships with twenty or more. Nine inspectors "work" with fourteen or more boards, while only seven have fewer than twelve boards in their supervisory districts. The mean number of boards for all supervisory districts is 13.75.

The distribution of school boards within the supervisory districts by religious denomination is shown in Table X. There are only twenty-four amalgamated school systems in a total of 175 boards which represent the Protestant population in all of the sixteen districts. Forty-five Roman Catholic boards represent two hundred schools with a mean of 4.4 schools, or 538.3 pupils, per board. One hundred seventy-five Protestant boards, on the other hand, administer 568 schools with a mean of only 3.2 schools, or 278.8 pupils, per board. In spite of the fact that the mean enrollment of Protestant schools is smaller than that of Roman Catholic schools, less consolidation of school boards has been achieved. Many districts have from two to six school boards of the same religious denomination, and in the majority of supervisory districts all religious denominations are represented, hence, the large number of boards in relation to total pupil enrollment.



TABLE IX  
NUMBER OF SCHOOL BOARDS IN SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS

Number of Boards	Number of Districts
20 - 21	2
18 - 19	1
16 - 17	4
14 - 15	2
12 - 13	0
10 - 11	6
8 - 9	0
6 - 7	0
4 - 5	1
Number of districts	16
Total number of boards	220
Mean number of boards	13.75

TABLE X  
NUMBER OF SCHOOL BOARDS IN SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS BY RELIGIOUS  
DENOMINATION

District	Number of School Boards						Other	Total
	Amal.	R.C.	Ang.	U.C.	S.A.	Pent.		
1	--	8	--	2	1	--	--	11
2	1	2	5	4	2	1	1	16
3	--	--	4	4	2	1	--	11
4	--	1	4	4	1	--	--	10
5	--	2	1	1	--	--	--	4
6	2	1	2	7	3	1	--	16
7	3	1	6	5	2	1	--	18
8	--	1	8	1	--	--	--	10
9	1	5	4	5	--	1	1	17
10	2	9	2	1	--	1	--	15
11	1	1	1	3	3	1	--	10
12	4	4	3	6	2	1	--	20
13	--	1	4	6	2	1	--	14
14	2	2	2	4	1	0	--	11
15	1	3	4	4	2	2	--	16
16	7	4	4	3	2	1	--	21
Total	24	45	54	60	23	12	2	220





Number of Principals and Teachers and Their Professional Qualifications and Experience

The number of principals and teachers in each supervisory district and their professional qualifications and experience in education will help to circumscribe the role of the supervising inspector in instructional supervision and the supervisory needs of the district. The total number of principals of schools with two or more rooms in the districts is 485. The number of principals varies from fourteen in one of the smaller districts to forty-nine in one of the larger districts, as indicated in Table XI. Four supervising inspectors have forty-four principals or more in their districts and seven have twenty-eight or less. The mean number of principals for all districts is 30.31.

The total number of teachers employed in sixteen districts, including teachers in one-room schools, is 2,093. Table XII gives the distribution of teachers within the supervisory districts. The number varies from seventy-four in one of the smaller districts to 248 in the largest district, the mean being 130.81. Five inspectors are each responsible for more than 150 teachers, while the other eleven have 130 teachers or less under their jurisdiction.

The professional qualifications of principals of all schools with two or more rooms, except five, in the supervisory districts are summarized in Table XIII, page 84. Principals, as well as teachers, in Newfoundland receive a teaching grade from the Department of Education corresponding numerically to the number of years spent in university training, provided that minimum pedagogical requirements are fulfilled.



TABLE XI  
NUMBER OF PRINCIPALS IN SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS

Number of Principals	Number of Districts
49 - 53	1
44 - 48	3
39 - 43	0
34 - 38	1
29 - 33	4
24 - 28	3
19 - 23	1
14 - 18	3
Number of supervisory districts	16
Total number of principals	485
Mean number of principals	30.31

TABLE XII  
NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS INCLUDING  
TEACHERS IN ONE-ROOM SCHOOLS

Number of Teachers	Number of Districts
230 - 249	2
210 - 229	0
190 - 209	0
170 - 189	1
150 - 169	2
130 - 149	3
110 - 129	1
90 - 109	2
70 - 89	5
Number of supervisory districts	16
Total number of teachers	2093
Mean number of teachers	130.81





TABLE XIII

## PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS OF PRINCIPALS IN SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS

Professional Qualifications		Number of Principals
Grade VI	Master's degree or equivalent	3
Grade V	B.A., or B.Sc., and B.Ed.	13
Grade IV	B.A. (Ed.)	63
Grade III	Three years of university	41
Grade II	Two years of university	69
Grade I	One year of university	161
Teaching License	Less than one year of training	130
Total		480 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Five schools in one district were not reported.



Three principals only, have attained masters' degrees, and thirteen two bachelors' degrees. Although sixty-three principals have a bachelor's degree in Education, the vast majority, fully 75 per cent of the 480 principals, have had not more than two years of university training. More than 27 per cent of all principals have had less than one year of training. The fact that 75 per cent of all principals have had not more than two years of university training is a serious situation, when it is realized that they should be providing instructional leadership for teachers. It should be noted that the terminal high school grade in Newfoundland is the eleventh, or junior matriculation.

The professional qualifications of teachers in 763 of the 768 schools in sixteen districts are presented in Table XIV. Two teachers only, have masters' degrees and ten have two bachelors' degrees. One hundred seven, and fifty-seven teachers, have had four and three years of university training, respectively. However, more than 90 per cent of all teachers, or 1,877, have had not more than two years of university training, and 52.6 per cent have had less than one year of professional training. One thousand eighty teachers have received less training than would seem to be the basic minimum for employment in teaching. The need for careful guidance and leadership for those teachers through instructional supervision is indeed pronounced.

The amount of administrative and teaching experience which principals and teachers have had, respectively, is also significant for the supervising inspector's role in instructional supervision. Seventy-nine of the 480 principals reported, or 16.5 per cent, have completed only



TABLE XIV  
PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS OF TEACHERS IN SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS

Professional Qualifications		Number of Teachers
Grade VI	Master's degree or equivalent	2
Grade V	B.A., or B.Sc., and B.Ed.	10
Grade IV	B.A. (Ed.)	107
Grade III	Three years of university	57
Grade II	Two years of university	135
Grade I	One year of university	662
Teaching License	Less than one year of training	1,080
Total		2,053 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Teachers in only 763 of 768 schools were reported.





their first year of administrative experience. Two hundred fifty-seven principals, or 53.5 per cent, have had not more than five years of administrative experience. Although 30.4 per cent, or 146 principals, have been in administration for more than ten years, their low qualifications generally suggest the need for an active in-service training program for principals. Nine hundred seventy-one of the 2,053 teachers reported, or more than 47 per cent, have had not more than two years of teaching experience, and 1,475, or 71.8 per cent, have had fewer than six years of experience. Only 262 teachers, or 12.76 per cent, have spent more than ten years in the profession.

Overlap in Supervisory Districts and in Administrative Responsibilities for School Systems

There seems to be a minimum of overlap in the organization of supervisory districts. Each supervising inspector is usually responsible for all school systems within his geographical area, regardless of the religious denominations of the systems, provided the systems are of the types normally assigned to supervising inspectors. In only one instance was there overlap reported among districts with respect to the responsibilities of supervising inspectors. In one supervisory district, a single school system is administered by the supervising inspector of an adjacent district.

Although the responsibilities of supervising inspectors are usually confined to the geographical limits of their districts, a number of school systems within their geographical areas are not under their jurisdiction. These are regional high school systems which are



administered by the assistants to the chief superintendents of the denominational divisions, in conjunction with the supervising principals of these systems. Sixteen inspectors reported that fourteen school boards and fifty-three schools within their geographical areas receive this form of educational administration.

## II. BACKGROUND OF THE SUPERVISING INSPECTOR

This section of the questionnaire was concerned with the academic qualifications of supervising inspectors and their teaching and administrative experience. Questions were included also to determine the specific pre-service and in-service administrative training which they have had, and their views on the adequacy of their training were solicited.

### Academic Qualifications, Teaching and Administrative Experience

The academic qualifications of the supervising inspectors are presented in Table XV. Two of the seventeen inspectors have masters' degrees, one of which is in Education. Eleven hold one bachelor's degree, with a major in Education, and one has a bachelor of science degree. Three supervisors hold no degree of any type. Although the majority of the inspectors have not qualified for a second degree, several have undertaken studies beyond the baccalaureate, six having spent one semester or more in university residence.

Supervising inspectors have had several years of teaching and administrative experience. The number of years spent in teaching by the seventeen supervisors, excluding those years spent as teaching and full-time principals, is revealed in Table XVI. Only two inspectors have





TABLE XV

## ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS OF DISTRICT SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

Academic Qualifications	Number of Supervising Inspectors
M.A.	1
M.A. (Education)	1
B.A., or B.Sc., and B.Ed.	0
B.A., or B.Sc. (Education)	11
B.Sc.	1
Three years of university	3
Total number of inspectors	17

TABLE XVI

## YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF SUPERVISING INSPECTORS AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Years of Experience	Number of Supervising Inspectors
14 - 15	1
12 - 13	0
10 - 11	1
8 - 9	2
6 - 7	2
4 - 5	4
2 - 3	2
0 - 1	5
Total number of supervising inspectors	17
Total number of years of experience	77
Mean number of years of experience	4.53



spent ten years or more as classroom teachers. Although eight have had from four to nine years of experience as classroom teachers, seven have had three years or less. Four inspectors have had no experience as classroom teachers. The mean number of years spent as classroom teachers by the inspectors is 4.53.

Experience in teaching at the elementary grade level has special significance for the role of the inspector in instructional supervision. The experience of the supervising inspectors as teachers of the elementary grades is presented in Table XVII. Although three have had from six to nine years of experience in elementary teaching, and six have had from two to five years, eight inspectors, or nearly one-half, have had not more than one year of experience as classroom teachers of the elementary grades. The mean number of years spent at the elementary grade level by the supervisors is 2.59.

The mean number of years spent as classroom teachers of high school grades by supervising inspectors, as indicated by the preceding paragraphs, is less than that spent as elementary teachers. No supervisor has had more than seven years of experience as a high school teacher. Although seven have had from two to seven years in this capacity, ten have had not more than one year. Seven inspectors have had no experience as classroom teachers of high school grades.

For the majority of the inspectors, most of their experience in education prior to their present appointments, has been derived from their occupancy of principalships of small schools. The experience which they have had as teaching and/or full-time principals is presented in Table XVIII. Seven inspectors have had ten years or more of experience



TABLE XVII

## YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF SUPERVISING INSPECTORS AS ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

Years of Experience	Number of Supervising Inspectors
8 - 9	2
6 - 7	1
4 - 5	2
2 - 3	4
0 - 1	8
Total number of supervising inspectors	17
Total years of experience in elementary teaching	44
Mean number of years of experience	2.59

TABLE XVIII

## YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF SUPERVISING INSPECTORS AS TEACHING AND/OR FULL-TIME PRINCIPALS

Years of Experience	Number of Supervising Inspectors
24 - 25	1
22 - 23	0
20 - 21	0
18 - 19	1
16 - 17	0
14 - 15	2
12 - 13	0
10 - 11	3
8 - 9	0
6 - 7	4
4 - 5	1
2 - 3	5
Total number of supervising inspectors	17
Total number of years of experience	148
Mean number of years of experience	8.7





in this capacity, five from four to seven years, and five have had three years or less. No inspector has had less than two years of experience as a school principal, the mean being 8.7 years.

The largest number of rooms in schools administered by sixteen supervising inspectors, while they were principals, is shown in Table XIX. Only two supervisors have been principals of school systems having more than fifteen classrooms. Although nine inspectors have held the principalships of schools with five to fourteen rooms, five have never been principals of schools having more than four rooms, and the largest number for one inspector was two rooms. The mean number of rooms of the largest schools administered by the inspectors, as principals, is only 8.44.

In addition to the experience in administration which they have had as school principals, most of the inspectors have spent several years in their present positions. As disclosed in Table XX, three have been employed as supervising inspectors for more than fifteen years, five from eight to fourteen years, and four have had from four to six years of experience in their present jobs. Only five inspectors have occupied their present positions for less than four years. The mean number of years spent in the superintendency by the seventeen inspectors is 9.35.

#### Pre-Service and In-Service Administrative Training

The importance of administrative training in preparation programs for school superintendents has been emphasized in the related literature. With a view to determining just what specific administrative preparation



TABLE XIX

LARGEST NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS ADMINISTERED BY SUPERVISING INSPECTORS  
AS SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Number of Classrooms	Number of Supervising Inspectors
30 - 34	1
25 - 29	0
20 - 24	0
15 - 19	1
10 - 14	2
5 - 9	7
0 - 4	5
Total number of supervising inspectors	16
Total number of classrooms	135
Mean number of classrooms	8.44

TABLE XX

EXPERIENCE OF SUPERVISING INSPECTORS IN PRESENT POSITIONS

Years of Experience	Number of Supervising Inspectors
28 - 31	1
24 - 27	1
20 - 23	0
16 - 19	1
12 - 15	3
8 - 11	2
4 - 7	4
0 - 3	5
Total number of supervising inspectors	17
Total number of years of experience	159
Mean number of years of experience	9.35



supervising inspectors have had for their job other than their academic training and experience as principals, they were asked to list any administrative training, taken before becoming inspectors, which they considered helpful in the performance of their tasks. This information is presented in Table XXI. A majority of the supervising inspectors stated that they had received no specific administrative preparation for their duties before becoming inspectors. One inspector gained valuable experience from field work with a senior supervising inspector; another found that principals' workshops provided valuable assistance, and a third mentioned university studies in supervision. Also submitted was the training obtained from personnel management courses. Thirteen supervisors, however, replied that they had had no specific pre-service administrative preparation which they considered helpful in fulfilling their duties as an inspector.

Supervising inspectors were asked if they felt that they had been adequately prepared for their present responsibilities before assuming them. Only four inspectors replied that their training and experience, prior to their appointment, had been adequate. The administrative areas in which thirteen inspectors felt that they had lacked adequate preparation are summarized in Table XXII. Eight inspectors listed a lack of training in administration, especially supervision, as the chief cause of their inadequacy of preparation, while one submitted a lack of administrative experience. Four supervisors lacked specialization in teaching methods and in program development for the elementary grades, and one mentioned his unfamiliarity with Department of Education







TABLE XXI

PRE-SERVICE ADMINISTRATIVE PREPARATION CONSIDERED HELPFUL  
BY SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

Type of Preparation	Number of Times Mentioned
Field experiences with supervising inspector	1
Personnel management courses	1
Experience as director of youth groups	1
Experience from principals' workshops	1
University courses in supervision	1
No specific preparation	13
Total number of responses	18
Total number of inspectors	17

TABLE XXII

ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS IN WHICH SUPERVISING INSPECTORS LACKED PRE-SERVICE  
PREPARATION FOR TASKS

Type of Preparation	Number of Times Mentioned
Training in administration, especially supervision	8
Experience in administration	1
Specialization in teaching methods and in program development in elementary grades	4
Knowledge of Department of Education regulations and policies	1
Knowledge of educational systems	1
Knowledge of trends in curriculum development	1
Number of responses	16
Number of inspectors	13



regulations and policies. Also noted was a lack of knowledge of educational systems elsewhere and of trends in curriculum development.

An attempt was made to ascertain the extent to which supervising inspectors have benefited from in-service administrative training. They were thus asked to mention any in-service training which they have had which has helped in the performance of their duties. The replies are listed in Table XXIII. Five inspectors stated that they have found supervisors' workshops helpful in the fulfillment of their administrative responsibilities. Five found C.E.A. Short Courses valuable, and four mentioned university courses. Also submitted as useful in-service training were the annual conference for supervisors, professional reading, principals' workshops, and local conferences. One inspector regarded his experience from teaching summer school courses for teachers, and another, the experience gained from directing summer schools for teachers, as valuable administrative training. Six supervisors, however, felt that they have had no in-service training which has helped in the performance of their administrative tasks.

Although a majority of the supervising inspectors felt that they had advanced professionally through in-service training, most of them were emphatic in stating a need for additional preparation for their administrative role when asked if further preparation was desirable. Only one inspector contended that further training was unnecessary; however, three did not respond to this question. Supervisors' responses are presented in Table XXIV, page 98. Nine inspectors stressed a need for training in educational administration, especially supervision.



TABLE XXIII

IN-SERVICE ADMINISTRATIVE TRAINING CONSIDERED HELPFUL  
BY SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

Type of Training	Number of Times Mentioned
Supervisors' workshops	5
C.E.A. Short Courses	5
University courses	4
Annual supervisors' conference	3
Professional reading	3
Principals' workshops	1
Local conferences	1
Teaching summer school courses	1
Administering summer schools for teachers	1
Experience from adjusting curriculum for Indian schools	1
No specific training	6
Total number of responses	31
Total number of inspectors	17





TABLE XXIV  
TRAINING CONSIDERED DESIRABLE BY SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

Type of Training	Number of Times Mentioned
Training in educational administration, especially supervision	9
Specialization in primary and elementary subject areas, especially reading	6
More elaborate program of in-service training	3
Specialized training in high school subject areas-- English, mathematics, and science	2
Training in curriculum development	2
Training in directing remedial work	1
Knowledge of organization of school systems	1
Public relations	1
Use of teaching media--radio and television	1
Experience in teaching	1
No training required	1
Number of responses	28
Number of supervising inspectors	14 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Three inspectors did not respond to the question.



Six thought that specialization in primary and elementary subject areas, especially in reading, was desirable, while three suggested a more elaborate program of in-service training. The need for specialization in subject fields at the high school level was mentioned by two supervising inspectors and two perceived a need for training in curriculum development. Also mentioned, were training in directing remedial work, a knowledge of the organization of school systems elsewhere, and training in public relations. One inspector would like to be able to utilize the potential of radio and television as teaching media and one considered further teaching experience desirable.

Since superintendents' associations and professional study groups provide in-service training for incumbents of the school superintendency, supervising inspectors were asked to indicate if they were members of an association or of any special study groups. Although two of the seventeen supervisors who returned questionnaires gave no response to this question, almost one-half of the respondents indicated that they are not members of a professional association or of any special study groups. Five of the supervising inspectors are members of the Canadian Association of School Superintendents and Inspectors, and one is a member of the American Association of School Administrators. Two more have memberships in the Canadian Education Association. In view of the fact, however, that most of the supervising inspectors stated a need for additional professional training, it is difficult to understand why at least seven of them are not utilizing the opportunities available for professional growth.



Comparison of Qualifications of Supervising Inspectors, Principals and Teachers

The academic qualifications of supervising inspectors in eight of sixteen supervisory districts compare favourably with those of the most highly qualified principals. In the remaining eight districts, there are some principals whose academic training exceeds that of their supervising inspectors. As shown in Table XXV, twenty principals may be placed in this category. The number of principals in each district varies from one, in each of two districts, to five, in each of two districts.

Similarly, in nine of the districts, the academic qualifications of supervising inspectors equal or exceed those of all teachers. In seven districts, however, as summarized in Table XXVI, there are twenty-four teachers who have attained higher academic qualifications than the inspectors who supervise their work. The number of such teachers in each district varies from one, in each of two districts, to ten, in one district.

In several districts, supervising inspectors are responsible for the direction and supervision of work of principals and teachers who have acquired higher academic qualifications than the supervisors themselves.

### III. SUMMARY

The first section of the questionnaire was designed to provide a picture of the potential educational responsibilities of supervising inspectors in Newfoundland. The total area of sixteen supervisory







TABLE XXV

NUMBER OF SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS IN WHICH ONE OR MORE PRINCIPALS  
HAVE ATTAINED HIGHER ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS  
THAN THE SUPERVISING INSPECTOR

Number of Principals	Number of Districts
5 principals	2
4 principals	0
3 principals	0
2 principals	4
1 principal	2
Number of supervisory districts	8
Number of principals	20

TABLE XXVI

NUMBER OF SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS IN WHICH ONE OR MORE TEACHERS HAVE  
ATTAINED HIGHER ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS THAN THE  
SUPERVISING INSPECTOR

Number of Teachers	Number of Districts
10 teachers	1
4 teachers	1
3 teachers	2
2 teachers	1
1 teacher	2
Number of supervisory districts	7
Number of teachers	24



districts is 20,465 square miles, the mean area being 1,279 square miles. The average number of communities in each supervisory district is 32.2 and the mean number of schools in all districts is forty-eight. In 1963-64, the sixteen districts had a total pupil population of 73,004, the mean being 4,562.75. More than 23 per cent of the total pupil population attended schools having not more than two classrooms, and only 21.6 per cent of all pupils attended schools with more than ten rooms. Sixteen supervising inspectors were assigned officially to 220 local boards of education. Although one inspector was associated with only four boards, two had twenty boards or more in their supervisory districts. The mean number of principals for the sixteen districts was 30.31, and the mean number of teachers was 130.81. Seventy-five per cent of the 480 principals, whose qualifications were reported, had not more than two years of university training, and more than 50 per cent of the 2,053 teachers had less than one year of training beyond grade eleven.

The second section of the questionnaire was concerned with the academic qualifications of supervising inspectors and their teaching and administrative experience. Questions were included also to determine their specific pre-service and in-service administrative training and their views on training. Only two of the seventeen inspectors had masters' degrees. Eleven held one bachelor's degree with a major in Education, and one, a bachelor of science degree. Three inspectors held no degree of any kind. The mean number of years spent as classroom teachers by the supervisors was 4.53 of which 2.59 were spent at the



elementary grade level and 1.94 at the high school level. Most of the experience in education which supervising inspectors had had, prior to their present appointments, was gained as principals of small schools. The mean number of years spent as teaching and/or full-time principals by the inspectors was 8.7. Most of the inspectors had spent several years in their present positions, only five having occupied their present job for less than four years. The mean number of years spent in the superintendency by all inspectors was 9.35.

A majority of the inspectors reported that they had received inadequate administrative preparation for their duties before becoming inspectors. Although a majority had benefited from in-service training, most of the supervisors emphasized a need for additional preparation for their administrative role. The need for training in educational administration, especially supervision, was stressed by a majority of the inspectors. Six felt that specialization in primary and elementary subject areas especially in reading, was desirable. A need for training in curriculum development, remedial work, and public relations was also expressed. In eight of the supervisory districts, twenty principals had attained higher academic qualifications than their supervising inspectors, and in seven districts, twenty-four teachers had received more formal training than the supervisors themselves.







## CHAPTER VI

### FUNCTIONS AND WORK LOAD OF THE SUPERVISING INSPECTOR

This section of the questionnaire sought to provide information for an analysis of the administrative role of the supervising inspector in his relationships with school boards, principals and teachers, and the Department of Education. The views of the inspector on the effectiveness of his functions and on the educational organization are also described, and characteristics of his work load are presented in detail.

#### I. ADVISORY AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS: SUPERVISOR-SCHOOL BOARD RELATIONSHIPS

The significance of the educational leadership which should be exercised by the school superintendent in his relationships with school boards has been emphasized in the related literature. Apart from ensuring that the school law and regulations of the Department of Education are enforced, however, the authority of the superintendent must be limited, if school government is to function democratically at the local level. While the prerogative to accept leadership should be vested in local boards, such boards through various means can be encouraged to utilize the professional services which may be available to them.



Proportion of Boards Soliciting Assistance, and Services Rendered by  
Supervising Inspectors

Supervising inspectors were asked to state the proportion of their school boards which solicit assistance and advice in educational matters. The information received is presented in Table XXVII. Only 55 per cent of the 220 school boards to which sixteen supervisors have been assigned request professional assistance in the performance of their duties. The percentage of boards which request assistance in the administration of their schools varies from five per cent, in one district, to 100 per cent, in three districts. In seven supervisory districts, less than 50 per cent of all school boards regard the supervising inspector as their professional advisor. Although the mean number of boards to which sixteen inspectors are assigned is 13.75, the mean number which request professional guidance from the inspectors in all districts is only 7.62. Almost one hundred school boards in the sixteen districts function without the professional services of a provincially appointed superintendent, except for those services which may be classified as regulatory.

The supervising inspectors were asked to list the administrative areas in which they are requested by school boards to provide most assistance. The types of duties with which boards seem to require most help are presented in Table XXVIII, p. 107. Sixteen inspectors reported that teacher appraisal ranks highly among the requests of school boards. Eight listed selection and recruitment of staff as an administrative responsibility in which their advice and assistance are sought frequently,



TABLE XXVII

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOL BOARDS IN EACH DISTRICT WHICH SOLICIT  
THE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES OF SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

District	Total Number of Boards	Number of Boards Soliciting Services	Percentage of Boards Soliciting Services
1	11	1	9
2	16	4	25
3	11	4	36
4	10	5	50
5	4	3	75
6	16	7	44
7	18	18	100
8	10	9	90
9	17	15	88
10	15	3	20
11	10	8	80
12	20	15	75
13	14	14	100
14	11	11	100
15	16	4	25
16	21	1	5
Total	220	122	
Mean	13.75	7.62	





TABLE XXVIII

ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS IN WHICH SUPERVISING INSPECTORS ARE REQUESTED TO  
PROVIDE MOST ASSISTANCE BY BOARDS

Administrative Areas	Number of Times Mentioned
Teacher Appraisal	16
Selection and Recruitment of Staff	8
Planning for additional facilities and for the replacement of facilities	7
Board-Teacher Relationships	3
Interpretation of the Education Act and Department Policies	4
Planning Centralization and Joint Services	2
Discipline Problems	1
Educational Finance	2
Board-Principal Relationships	1
Organization of Parent-Teacher Associations	2
Advising on Equipment and Supplies	1
Number of responses	47
Number of supervising inspectors	16



while seven stated that the planning for additional facilities and for the replacement of facilities is considered by boards to be a duty in which advice and assistance are desirable. Four inspectors mentioned interpreting The Education Act and the policies of the Department of Education, and three others, the problem of solving board and teacher differences. Also submitted as administrative areas in which most assistance is sought were planning for centralization and joint services, discipline problems, and problems of finance. One inspector reported the request for assistance in solving board-principal difficulties and two others the assistance sought in organizing parent-teacher associations.

Since supervising inspectors have not been assigned assistants or specialist teachers to supplement their efforts in the provision of adequate instructional supervision, and since it was felt that a profusion of school boards might encroach upon the time available for the performance of administrative tasks, inspectors were asked to indicate if they are able to give full assistance in determining and in executing educational policies in all instances where boards solicit their help. All sixteen inspectors stated that they are able to provide the administrative assistance requested at the present time. Ten of the inspectors, however, mentioned the infrequency of requests by boards for assistance and that several boards in their supervisory districts request no assistance in the administration of their schools. Six inspectors reported that they are able to provide the requested administrative assistance despite the fact that those boards which request professional



guidance do so fairly frequently. However, in only two instances are these supervising inspectors acting as professional advisors to more than 90 per cent of their boards and of the remaining four supervisors, three provide professional leadership for less than 75 per cent of the boards in their supervisory districts.

An indication of the degree of the inspectors' participation in the administrative duties for which school boards are responsible is provided by the number of times each year, as an average, that the inspector meets each board in his district. This information is provided in Table XXIX. The mean number of meetings held with all boards in their districts by eight inspectors is only one. Five reported that the mean number of times all boards in their districts are met annually is just twice. The mean number of meetings with all boards is three for two supervisors, while only one inspector has a mean number of four meetings with all boards in his district. It is interesting to note that the three latter inspectors are responsible for ten, seventeen, and sixteen boards, respectively. The mean number of boards for all supervisory districts is substantially less than the number in two of the districts in which supervising inspectors have the highest frequency of meetings. The mean number of meetings convened annually with all school boards in the sixteen supervisory districts is only 1.75.

All of the inspectors could provide more administrative assistance and leadership for their boards than is being provided at the present time. When asked how frequently they could meet all boards annually without infringing on their allotment of time to instructional





TABLE XXIX

NUMBER OF TIMES ANNUALLY SUPERVISING INSPECTORS MEET ALL BOARDS IN  
THEIR RESPECTIVE SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS

Mean Number of Meetings Per Board	Number of Supervising Inspectors
4	1
3	2
2	5
1	8
Mean number of meetings with boards in all districts	1.75
Number of supervising inspectors	16



supervision and its accompanying responsibilities, the supervisors submitted the information summarized in Table XXX. One inspector reported that he could attend twelve meetings annually with all of his boards. In this district, it should be noted, there are only four boards. Three inspectors could meet with boards six times or more, and eight inspectors could meet their boards at least four times. Only four supervisors felt that they would be unable to devote more than three meetings annually to each of their school boards. The mean number of times that supervising inspectors could meet all of their boards annually is 4.75. The evidence seems to indicate that some school boards are not fully utilizing the professional services which may be rendered by supervising inspectors in the administration of school board responsibilities.

#### Involvement in Administrative Duties

It was felt that the administrative role of the supervising inspector in his relationships with school boards could be described most effectively in terms of the degree of responsibility held for several clearly defined administrative duties. It should be understood, however, that the supervising inspector's administrative role is subject to variation in his relationships with different boards, depending upon board expectations, and that the purpose of this analysis is to describe his usual administrative tasks. The form that these tasks assume is presented in Table XXXI.

All of the supervising inspectors participate in the selection and placement of teachers. Although seven of the inspectors stated that



TABLE XXX

NUMBER OF TIMES ANNUALLY SUPERVISING INSPECTORS COULD MEET BOARDS  
IN SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS IF REQUESTED

Mean Number of Meetings Per Board	Number of Supervising Inspectors
12	1
11	0
10	0
9	0
8	0
7	1
6	2
5	3
4	5
3	2
2	2
Mean number of meetings with all boards	4.75
Number of supervising inspectors	16

TABLE XXXI

THE DEGREE TO WHICH SUPERVISING INSPECTORS ASSUME ADMINISTRATIVE  
DUTIES FOR SCHOOL BOARDS

Type of Duties	Full Respon.	Number of Supervising Inspectors			Total
		Assist	Advise	Not Involved	
Hiring and placing teachers	0	7	9	0	16
Hiring and placing principals	0	5	8	3	16
Planning school buildings	0	5	7	4	16
Hiring of caretakers	0	0	4	12	16
Deciding and arranging repairs to buildings, grounds, equip.	0	3	7	6	16
Deciding on and purchasing pupil and teacher supplies and equipment	0	2	9	5	16
Organizing pupil trans- portation	0	3	4	9	16
Budgeting of school funds	0	0	2	14	16





they assist boards in the procurement and placement of staff, nine others confine their participation in this administrative duty to an advisory role. No supervising inspector takes full responsibility for the staffing of school systems. The administrative area of staff selection and placement seems to be one in which boards delegate considerable responsibility to inspectors, since it has been seen already that teacher evaluation is among the duties with which boards require most assistance.

Although the majority of inspectors advise or assist in the selection and placement of principals, three reported that they are in no way involved in the performance of this duty. Eight supervisors act in an advisory capacity only, to boards or their representatives, and five share the responsibility with boards for the hiring and placing of principals. No inspector has been delegated full responsibility for the performance of this administrative task.

Supervising inspectors seem to be actively involved in planning school buildings in their supervisory districts. Twelve inspectors reported that they either assist or advise boards or their representatives in this respect. Although seven have been delegated an advisory role only, five actually assist boards in the execution of this administrative responsibility. Four inspectors are not involved with this task, and as might be expected, no supervisor takes full responsibility for this administrative duty.

Supervisors are less actively engaged in the selection of maintenance personnel. Only four inspectors stated that they have any responsibilities for the hiring of caretakers. In all four instances, their



role is an advisory one only. Twelve inspectors do not participate in this school board responsibility.

Responsibilities for deciding on and arranging for repairs to buildings, grounds, and equipment vary among supervisory districts. Three supervisors assist school boards or their representatives in executing this duty. Seven inspectors reported that they act in an advisory capacity when buildings, grounds and equipment are in a state of disrepair. Six of the supervisors are not involved with this administrative responsibility and no supervising inspector takes full responsibility for the maintenance of school property.

The provision of aid in purchasing supplies and equipment is usually not assumed by supervising inspectors. Only two inspectors reported that they assist boards in purchasing school supplies and equipment. Nine inspectors, however, advise boards on school requirements in this area. Five of the supervisors take no responsibility whatsoever for this task and no inspector takes full responsibility.

A majority of the supervising inspectors have been delegated no responsibility for the organization of pupil transportation. Although three stated that they assist with this task, and four act in an advisory capacity, nine inspectors submitted that this duty is outside the realm of their associations with school boards.

The administrative area of school finance is, for the most part, outside the jurisdiction of supervising inspectors. Only two of the supervisors stated that they advise boards or their representatives on financial matters. The remaining fourteen inspectors reported that they





are in no way responsible for this administrative duty.

Although their responsibilities for the administration of school board duties extend categorically from no involvement to the provision of assistance in the execution of administrative tasks, in no instances do supervising inspectors act as executive officers for local boards of education. According to the information received, school boards, themselves, act as administrators.

The administrative practices observed by school boards in the performance of their duties when supervising inspectors are only partially responsible or have no responsibility for the execution of these duties are summarized in Table XXXII. Although qualified principals with sufficient time could conceivably perform the functions of an administrator with respect to school board responsibilities, which would indeed conform to educational theory, such a situation does not occur in the supervisory districts. School boards, themselves, act as administrators in instances where they have delegated some responsibility to supervising inspectors and in instances where they have not.

In all supervisory districts, school boards retain the executive function of hiring and placing teachers, with some boards receiving help from the supervising inspectors. Similarly, they act as administrators in hiring and placing principals, with some boards receiving assistance or advice from supervising inspectors in thirteen districts, and in two districts, from the chief superintendents at the Department of Education.

Boards also retain the executive responsibility in planning





TABLE XXXII

ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES WHEN  
SUPERVISING INSPECTORS ARE ONLY PARTIALLY RESPONSIBLE  
OR NOT INVOLVED

Type of Duties	Number of Supervisory Districts			Total
	School Boards	School Boards & Principals	Boards & Ch.Supts.	
Hiring and placing teachers	16			16
Hiring and placing principals	14		2	16
Planning school buildings	12		4	16
Hiring of caretakers	16			16
Deciding and arranging repairs to buildings, grounds and equipment	16			16
Deciding on and purchasing pupil and teacher supplies and equipment		16		16
Organizing pupil transportation	12		4	16
Budgeting of school funds	16			16
Number of supervisory districts				16



school buildings. In twelve supervisory districts, some boards receive advice or assistance from supervising inspectors and in four districts from the chief superintendents. In hiring caretakers, boards also assume the executive function themselves, receiving advice from inspectors in four districts only. Although some school boards in seven districts are advised by supervising inspectors and some receive assistance from the inspectors in three districts, they perform the administrative task of deciding on and arranging for repairs to buildings and equipment themselves. In eleven districts, boards receive advice or assistance from the inspectors in purchasing supplies and equipment; however, in all districts, principals are also actively involved with this duty. In the organization of pupil transportation, some school boards receive assistance or advice from supervising inspectors in seven districts and from the chief superintendents in four districts. Apart from the advice received from the supervisors in two districts, school boards take full responsibility in budgeting school funds.

#### Need for More Professional Assistance and Guidance

According to the views of supervising inspectors, school boards need more professional assistance and guidance at the local level in determining and in executing educational policies than they receive at the present time. Supporting educational theory, which suggests a need for professional advice and executive assistance for school boards in all circumstances, the sixteen inspectors showed unanimity in an expression of real need for increased assistance for boards in the supervisory



districts of Newfoundland.

Several reasons were stated to show the importunity of the need. One supervisor reported that the professional service given to boards in his district is of a minor nature and does not provide for adequate assistance. Four inspectors stated that school boards in their districts are incapable of managing their educational responsibilities effectively without more professional assistance than they are receiving. Two supervisors stressed the lack of formal education of their boards and consequently their lack of knowledge of educational procedures. One inspector felt that boards in his district are not trained to take responsibility in education, especially in financing education, and another reported that his boards give meagre attention to new programs in education. Two supervisors explained that errors in judgement made previously by boards in their districts might have been averted with proper professional advice and assistance. Finally, two other inspectors submitted that increased professional assistance might foster the consolidation of schools and of school boards on both a denominational and an amalgamated basis.

#### How Professional Assistance Should Be Provided

A majority of the supervising inspectors expressed the view that the professional assistance needed by school boards should be provided by supervising inspectors or provincially appointed superintendents. Twelve of the inspectors suggested this administrative arrangement; however, four felt that a local superintendent, or professional director, should be appointed to each "consolidated" board. One supervisor stated







his views in these words:

The Department must provide for a larger staff of supervising inspectors and boards must be encouraged to use the services of principals and inspectors on a larger scale. Imagine a board not using a trained person in their midst.

All of the inspectors were emphatic in stating that under the present educational organization more assistance can be provided for school boards by the inspectors than is presently being given, should school boards solicit this potential assistance. One inspector presented his view in this manner:

The supervising inspector should be given more opportunities to assist boards. The divisional chief superintendents should encourage school boards to seek the supervisor's advice. Boards should have supervisors and principals on professional committees.

Another inspector expressed a similar view:

Perhaps, if it were necessary for the supervising inspector to meet each board at regular intervals to give an oral report of his visit through the system, the door would be opened for the advisory and executive function to be fulfilled.

According to one supervising inspector, school boards in his district are not utilizing the services of either the principals or the supervising inspector:

In most centralized areas we have competent principals whose services are not being utilized, and even though the supervisory staff is small, many boards are not making use of it. We can provide as many principals and supervisors as we wish, but until boards are encouraged to seek professional leadership, little can be achieved.

#### Consolidation of Boards and Educational Efficiency

Most of the inspectors regard the consolidation of school boards, either on a denominational basis or on an amalgamated one, as a partial solution to the problem of providing effective educational leadership



for boards. Although only one inspector reported that school board consolidation has been achieved in his district, fourteen expressed the view that board consolidation would result in greater efficiency in most aspects of educational administration. One inspector stated that a duplication of educational effort is now necessary in the supervisory districts which would be reduced by school board consolidation, either denominationally or by amalgamation. Another inspector expressed the advantages in this way:

If the supervising inspector were assigned to one or two consolidated boards and thus had a small work load and a small area to cover, it could affect the degree of efficiency realized a great deal.

A third supervisor explained that the consolidation of boards would probably result in a better selection of school board members who would be more perceptive of educational needs and who would appreciate the significance of professional leadership in educational administration.

#### Most Satisfying and Most Difficult Aspects of Supervisor-Board Relationships

Since school boards and supervising inspectors have a common purpose in promoting the efficiency of the educational organization, it is essential that cooperation should permeate their relationships to facilitate the achievement of that purpose. Supervising inspectors were asked to list the most satisfying and the most difficult aspects of their work insofar as it relates to their relationships with school boards.

The most satisfying aspects of the supervisors' relationships with boards have been categorized and are presented in Table XXXIII. Eight of



TABLE XXXIII  
MOST SATISFYING ASPECTS OF SUPERVISOR-BOARD RELATIONSHIPS

Nature of Relationships	Number of Times Mentioned
Boards' acceptance of supervisors' services	8
Ability to assist boards when required	4
Assisting in formulation of board policy	2
Participating in teacher selection	2
Boards' enthusiasm in education	2
Boards' utilization of principals in formulating educational policy	1
Establishing framework for consolidation of systems	1
No response	2
Number of responses	20
Number of supervising inspectors	16





the inspectors find board acceptance of their services to be satisfactory in some instances, which is especially satisfying in view of the fact that all inspectors feel that boards are generally not fully utilizing their services. Four supervisors stated that their ability to provide assistance for boards when required and to promote the cause of education is most satisfying, while two mentioned the assistance rendered in the formulation of school board policy. Two inspectors regarded their participation in teacher selection as a source of satisfaction, and two others, the enthusiasm shown in education by their boards. One inspector reported that establishing a framework for the consolidation of school systems gives him a sense of accomplishment, and another felt that the utilization of principals by boards in formulating policy is indeed satisfying. Two of the sixteen inspectors did not respond to this question.

The most difficult aspects of the supervising inspectors' relationships with boards are shown in Table XXXIV. Five inspectors reported that many boards are indifferent to the services available and tend to formulate policies without consulting the inspectors. Two other inspectors emphasized a similar difficulty by stating that boards are reluctant to invite them to meetings. Ensuring that boards expend their funds judiciously is a particular problem for two supervising inspectors. Two reported that the most difficult aspects of their work with boards centre around board indifference to educational problems, while two others stated that boards often use teacher evaluation reports indiscriminately. One inspector felt that board-teacher relationships sometimes



TABLE XXXIV

## MOST DIFFICULT ASPECTS OF SUPERVISOR-BOARD RELATIONSHIPS

Nature of Relationships	Number of Times Mentioned
Boards' indifference to supervisory services	5
Obtaining requests to attend board meetings	2
Ensuring judicious expenditure of funds by boards	2
Indiscriminate use of teacher evaluation reports	2
Boards' indifference to educational problems	2
Solving problems arising from board-teacher relationships	1
Preventing community jealousies from militating against educational improvement	1
Boards' indifference to principal's role in instructional supervision	1
Lack of authority to improve educational conditions	1
No response	2
Number of responses	17
Number of supervising inspectors	16



create problems which present difficulties, and another considered the indifference shown by boards to the principal's role in supervision as an area of difficulty. Community jealousies and rivalry act as a deterrent to educational improvement in one supervisory district and one inspector considered the lack of authority to improve educational conditions as a drawback to educational progress.

## II. SUPERVISORY FUNCTION: SUPERVISOR-PRINCIPAL-TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS

In The Education Act, the duties of supervising inspectors are described as being primarily supervisory in nature. The supervising inspector is required to visit each school and college in his district as often as possible during the year and to assist principals and teachers in the planning of their work, its organization, and its evaluation.

### Time Devoted to Instructional Supervision

Sixteen supervising inspectors reported that they visit each school in their districts on an average of from two to six times each year. As shown in Table XXXV, one inspector visits each school in his district six times, and four supervisors are able to visit all of their schools four times annually. Although four other inspectors manage to visit their schools at least three times, seven, or almost one-half of the total number, make only two visits to each of their schools annually.

Since 75 per cent of the principals in sixteen of the supervisory districts under study have had not more than two years of university training, the significance of the supervising inspector's role as an





TABLE XXXV

NUMBER OF VISITS MADE ANNUALLY BY SUPERVISING INSPECTORS TO EACH  
SCHOOL IN THEIR RESPECTIVE SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS

Number of Visits	Number of Supervising Inspectors
6	1
5	0
4	4
3	4
2	7
Total number of visits	48
Mean number of visits	3
Number of supervising inspectors	16



instructional leader, for both principals and teachers, can be readily seen. The time given annually to instructional supervision by the inspectors has been calculated on the basis of seven-hour days, thus the total number of days given to this function may exceed the 190 days in the school year.

The majority of inspectors devote a major portion of their working time to various types of supervisory activities. As disclosed in Table XXXVI, supervising inspectors spend from 130 to 247 seven-hour days annually on various aspects of instructional supervision. Five supervisors spend two hundred days or more in classroom visitation, conferences and workshops, as well as in organizing the supervisory programs of principals and reporting. Seven inspectors devote from 152 to 190 days to these same activities. Only four supervisors spend less than 135 seven-hour days annually on various supervisory activities. The mean number of days given to instructional supervision annually by the sixteen inspectors is 176.4.

Supervisors spend most of the time given to instructional supervision in classroom visitation. In view of the fact that more than 50 per cent of the 2,053 teachers reported for sixteen districts have had less than one year of professional training, this approach to the supervisory program is justifiable. The number of days spent annually in classroom visitation by the inspectors and the mean number of days spent with each teacher using this supervisory technique are presented in Table XXXVII. Six supervisors spend from 151 to 207 seven-hour days in classroom visitation, and nine spend from 104 to 148 days. Only one



TABLE XXXVI

NUMBER OF DAYS GIVEN ANNUALLY TO THE SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION BY  
DISTRICT SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

Number of Days 1 day: 7 hours	Number of Supervising Inspectors
240 - 249	1
230 - 239	0
220 - 229	2
210 - 219	1
200 - 209	1
190 - 199	1
180 - 189	0
170 - 179	3
160 - 169	0
150 - 159	3
140 - 149	0
130 - 139	4
Total number of days	2,822
Number of supervising inspectors	16
Mean number of days	176.4





TABLE XXXVII

NUMBER OF DAYS SPENT ANNUALLY IN CLASSROOM VISITATION AND MEAN NUMBER  
OF DAYS GIVEN TO EACH TEACHER BY SUPERVISORS

District	Number of Days (1 day:7 hours)	Mean Days Per Teacher
1	207	1.2
2	196	2.3
3	189	.8
4	188	2.0
5	151	1.1
6	155	1.5
7	148	1.3
8	143	1.9
9	140	1.8
10	140	1.0
11	137	1.1
12	128	.8
13	105	1.4
14	105	.46
15	104	.6
16	83	.99
Total	2,319	20.25
Mean	145	1.27



inspector devotes less than one hundred days to this supervisory technique. The mean number of days spent in classroom visitation with each teacher varies from less than one-half day in one district to 2.3 days in one district. Five inspectors spend less than one day annually with each teacher using this supervisory technique. Six inspectors devote from one to 1.4 days to each teacher, and only three spend from 1.5 to 1.9 days with each teacher. In only two districts do teachers benefit from two days or more of classroom visitation by supervising inspectors annually. The mean number of days devoted to classroom visitation by all inspectors annually is 145 and the mean days per teacher is 1.27.

The second most frequently employed supervisory technique of the inspectors is group meetings and conferences with teachers. Sixteen inspectors spend a total of 202 days annually on this aspect of instructional supervision. As shown in Table XXXVIII, the number of days spent in this activity varies from only six in one district to thirty-four in another. Three inspectors devote 22 days or more to meetings and conferences, while four devote from 13 to 17 days to this activity. Nine inspectors, however, spend less than ten days on this phase of their supervisory program. The mean number of days given to meetings and conferences by all inspectors is 12.6.

Another supervisory technique used by supervising inspectors in their relationships with teachers is workshops. This activity is employed less frequently than the two previously mentioned. Supervisors spend a total of eighty-two days annually conducting teachers' workshops. As revealed in Table XXXIX, one inspector devotes fifteen days to



TABLE XXXVIII

NUMBER OF DAYS GIVEN ANNUALLY TO GROUP MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES WITH  
TEACHERS BY SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

Number of Days (1 day: 7 hours)	Number of Supervising Inspectors
30 - 34	1
25 - 29	0
20 - 24	2
15 - 19	1
10 - 14	3
5 - 9	9
Total	202
Mean	12.6

TABLE XXXIX

NUMBER OF DAYS SPENT ANNUALLY ON TEACHERS' WORKSHOPS BY SUPERVISING  
INSPECTORS

Number of Days (1 day: 7 hours)	Number of Supervising Inspectors
15 - 19	1
10 - 14	1
5 - 9	5
0 - 4	9
Total	82
Mean	5.1





educational workshops in his district. Although a second supervisor spends ten days in this activity, the majority of the inspectors spend less than five days annually on teachers' workshops. Nine supervising inspectors may be placed in this category. The mean number of days spent on this aspect of instructional supervision by all inspectors is 5.1.

Supervising inspectors spend a total of seventy-eight days in other supervisory activities with teachers. The number of days spent in other activities varies from fourteen in two districts to no days in seven districts. The mean number of days spent in other supervisory activities with teachers is 4.9.

The supervisors reported that they spend a total of 141 days annually with principals in organizing the principals' supervisory programs, assisting with program development, and in other supervisory activities. The number of days spent with principals, as shown in Table XL, varies from thirty-five in one supervisory district to no days in six districts. Two supervisors spend twenty days or more on this phase of supervision annually. Although five inspectors spend from ten to nineteen days with principals, and two from five to seven days, seven supervisors devote four days or less to principals annually, in activities which might foster well developed supervisory programs for principals. The mean number of days spent with principals annually is 8.8. It seems that the principal's role as an instructional leader is not considered to be very significant in the supervisory districts under study.



TABLE XL

NUMBER OF DAYS SPENT WITH PRINCIPALS ANNUALLY IN VARIOUS SUPERVISORY  
ACTIVITIES BY SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

Number of Days (1 day: 7 hours)	Number of Supervising Inspectors
35 - 39	1
30 - 34	0
25 - 29	0
20 - 24	1
15 - 19	1
10 - 14	4
5 - 9	2
0 - 4	7
Total	141
Mean	8.8



### The Inspector's Approach to Instructional Supervision

Having supplied the information concerning the amounts of time devoted to various aspects of their supervisory programs, supervising inspectors were asked to describe their approach to instructional supervision. All of the inspectors tend to regard instructional supervision as a means of improving the total learning situation through stimulation of teacher effort and educational leadership. Emphasis is thus placed upon assisting teachers in isolating, analyzing, and solving their problems. One inspector described his philosophy of supervision in these words:

The main purpose of supervision is to help in the improvement of instruction. I try to find out, as far as possible, the strengths and weaknesses of pupils, so that I may be able to offer some suggestions for improvement.

Another inspector stated that he places emphasis upon motivation, demonstration teaching and consultation in his supervisory relationships with teachers. A third supervisor summarized his approach to instructional supervision in this manner:

I feel that teachers should be made to feel at ease and to accept supervision; a positive attitude should thus be created. I aim through meetings, individual or group, to have teachers feel that they have a contribution to make in the formulation of educational policy. When weaknesses are observed, I am frank and honest with teachers and suggest how improvements might be effected.

Although the motivational and consultative functions of supervision are emphasized, evaluation of teachers is performed by all supervising inspectors in conformity with the requirements of The Education Act. Fourteen supervisors stated that they submit a formal report to the Department of Education annually on each teacher's effectiveness. One





supervisor stated that he does not get around to completing all reports, and another submitted that only three-fifths of all teachers in his district are reported on annually. Teacher evaluation is performed not only for the Department of Education, but, as stated earlier, for local boards as well. Ten supervisors report to all of their boards on each teacher's effectiveness; however, six inspectors stated that they submit reports to only some of their boards, excluding those boards which they feel might abuse the evaluations.

#### Adequacy of Supervisory Services

Supervising inspectors were asked whether they considered the supervisory services in their districts to be adequate insofar as supervising inspectors are concerned. Fifteen of the inspectors gave a negative answer. Only one inspector felt that the supervisory program in his district meets the educational requirements of school systems. Twelve supervising inspectors stated that their supervisory programs are limited by the large number of schools for which they are responsible. Six considered the problem of number to be compounded by the vast areas over which schools are scattered. The many unqualified teachers in supervisory districts were mentioned by six inspectors as contributing to the inadequacy of supervisory services, and two of the inspectors added that many of their principals are also unsuitably prepared for their tasks. Hazardous travel conditions impede the services of three inspectors, while two submitted that a lack of suitable materials and equipment in their schools restricts their supervisory programs. Two supervisors mentioned that the inadequacy of their administrative



preparation limits their supervisory services. Also mentioned as detracting from the efficiency of services were teacher turnover, lack of office facilities and "voluminous" report writing.

The supervising inspectors listed a number of methods by which they thought that their supervisory programs might be improved. Table XLI shows how they would effect these improvements. A majority of suggestions call for smaller supervisory districts, both in area and in number of educational personnel, thus providing for greater concentration in supervisory activities in each school. Eleven inspectors advocated this approach to the improvement of instructional supervision. Two supervisors suggested that the establishment of larger school units would alleviate the problem of providing adequate supervision. Such an arrangement would decrease the physical size of districts and would probably result in more competent administration by school principals. Three inspectors stated that office space would facilitate their supervisory programs and that office assistance would relieve them of clerical duties thus enabling them to devote more time to instructional supervision. One inspector suggested that an assistant who might concentrate on supervision in the elementary schools would greatly improve his supervisory program, and still another advocated visits of inexperienced teachers with experienced teachers as worthy of consideration.

### III. SUPERVISOR-DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATIONSHIPS

Provincially appointed superintendents should play a part in the formulation of policy at the provincial level since they are directly



TABLE XLI

METHODS ADVOCATED BY SUPERVISING INSPECTORS TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTIONAL  
SUPERVISION IN SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS

Methods	Number of Times Mentioned
Reduction in area of supervisory districts and in educational personnel	11
Establishment of larger school units	2
Office facilities and clerical assistance	3
Assistant supervising inspector	1
Visits of inexperienced teachers with experienced teachers	1
Number of responses	18
Number of supervising inspectors	15





involved in the implementation of the policy established by the central authority. It has been seen in the related literature that attempts have been made recently to create an awareness by Ministers of Education of the significance of the superintendents' role in policy-making.

#### The Inspector and Policy-Making at the Provincial Level

Supervising inspectors were asked if the Department of Education encourages their participation in the formulation of educational policy at the provincial level. A majority of the inspectors reported that they are very satisfied with the opportunities afforded them to contribute to provincial educational policies. Eleven supervisors stated that they offer suggestions in their annual reports as to how policy might be improved. At the annual supervisors' conference arranged by the officials of the Department, supervisors discuss various aspects of education and submit their recommendations to the Council of Education. Three inspectors also mentioned that they often present their views in discussions with the chief superintendents. Four inspectors, however, felt that insufficient encouragement is given to supervisors to participate in policies which affect them directly. One of the sixteen inspectors did not respond to the question.

Having been asked if they thought that they could contribute more to provincial policy than they actually help to determine, nine inspectors stated that they would like to be more active in formulating policy. Because of the present organization of supervisory districts, however, insufficient time is available for them to become involved. Four inspectors, who apparently have sufficient time, would like to be



given greater scope in the policy-making process. One of these inspectors suggested that there is a need for research projects in which supervisors could play an active part. Another submitted a need for more conferences and personal contacts with educational policy-makers, while a third suggested that he could provide better liaison between the Department and the local area should the opportunity be provided for greater participation in policy formulation. A fourth inspector stated that the Department of Education has not fully appreciated the supervisor's role as a policy-maker. Three of the sixteen inspectors did not respond to the question.

#### IV. WORK LOAD AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE SUPERVISING INSPECTOR'S TIME

Supervising inspectors were asked a number of questions relating to their work loads, the percentage of time actually devoted to their various functions, and the percentage of time they considered desirable for the performance of their various functions. They were also asked to list the least attractive and the most attractive aspects of their work. This section discusses the information elicited by these questions.

##### Length of Work Week

Supervising inspectors vary considerably in the amounts of time devoted to their duties. The number of hours spent in administration weekly by sixteen supervising inspectors is presented in Table XLII. While one inspector spends 84 hours on his job each week, two devote less than 40 hours to their administrative tasks. Three inspectors spend more than 54 hours on their job weekly, six from 45 to 50 hours, and



TABLE XLII

NUMBER OF HOURS SPENT IN ADMINISTRATION WEEKLY BY SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

Number of Hours	Number of Supervising Inspectors
80 - 84	1
75 - 79	0
70 - 74	1
65 - 69	0
60 - 64	0
55 - 59	1
50 - 54	3
45 - 49	3
40 - 44	5
35 - 39	2
Number of supervising inspectors	16
Total number of hours	767
Mean number of hours	48





five spend exactly 40 hours at their administrative tasks each week. The total number of hours given to administration weekly is 767 and the mean number of hours for all inspectors is forty-eight.

#### Percentage and Amount of Time Devoted To Various Duties

The distribution of the supervising inspectors' time among their various duties should provide further insight into their administrative role.

Supervision of instruction. Supervising inspectors devote the major portion of their working time to the supervision of instruction, as already stated. Table XLIII shows that two inspectors devote 80 per cent or more of their working time to this function, and that eight spend from 70 to 79 per cent of their time in instructional activities. Five inspectors devote from 60 to 69 per cent of their work week to this duty and only one spends less than 60 per cent of his time on instruction. The number of hours given to instructional supervision weekly varies from 24 to 45.5. Four inspectors spend more than 40 hours per week in instructional activities, five from 30 to 38 hours and seven from 24 to 29 hours. While the mean number of hours spent on all administrative tasks weekly is 48, the mean hours devoted to instructional supervision is 32.4.

Executing school board policies. The percentage of time spent in executing school board policies varies from 10 per cent for two inspectors to one per cent or less for six, as revealed in Table XLIV. Five inspectors spend from four to five per cent of their time on this



TABLE XLIII

PERCENTAGE OF TIME DEVOTED TO THE SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION BY  
SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

Percentage of Time	Number of Supervising Inspectors
80 - 84	2
75 - 79	2
70 - 74	6
65 - 69	3
60 - 64	2
55 - 59	0
50 - 54	1
Number of supervising inspectors	16
Mean number of hours weekly	32.4

TABLE XLIV

PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT IN EXECUTING SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES BY  
SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

Percentage of Time	Number of Supervising Inspectors
10 - 11	2
8 - 9	0
6 - 7	0
4 - 5	5
2 - 3	3
0 - 1	6
Number of supervising inspectors	16
Mean number of hours per week	1.74



function, while three spend from two to three per cent only. The number of hours devoted to this duty weekly, varies from 8.4 for one supervisor to zero hours for three. Six inspectors spend two hours or more weekly in executing board policy, four from 1.1 to 1.75 hours, while six devote less than one hour to this function. The mean number of hours spent in executing school board policies weekly by all inspectors is only 1.74.

Work for Department of Education. The percentage of the inspectors' time spent on administrative tasks for the Department of Education is presented in Table XLV. Three inspectors devote 15 per cent or more of their time to the preparation of examinations, to curriculum development and reports for the Department. Five supervisors spend from 10 per cent to 14 per cent of their time on Department work and six from five to nine per cent. Only two inspectors devote less than five per cent of their total working time to Department assignments. The number of hours given weekly to this work varies from 10.5 to exactly one hour. Five inspectors spend five hours or more on work for the Department, five spend from 3 to 4.5 hours, and six spend less than three hours. The mean number of hours spent weekly on assignments for the Department by all supervising inspectors is 3.87.

Attendance at board meetings and interviews with members. The percentage of their time spent in attendance at board meetings and in interviews with members by the supervising inspectors is disclosed in Table XLVI. Only one supervisor spends as much as six per cent of his time





TABLE XLV

PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT ON WORK FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
BY SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

Percentage of Time	Number of Supervising Inspectors
15 - 19	3
10 - 14	5
5 - 9	6
0 - 4	2
Number of supervising inspectors	16
Mean number of hours weekly	3.87

TABLE XLVI

PERCENTAGE OF TIME GIVEN TO BOARD MEETINGS AND INTERVIEWS WITH  
MEMBERS BY INSPECTORS

Percentage of Time	Number of Supervising Inspectors
6 - 7	1
4 - 5	8
2 - 3	5
0 - 1	2
Number of supervising inspectors	16
Mean number of hours weekly	1.78



on this duty. While eight inspectors spend from four to five per cent of their time on this duty, and five spend from two to three per cent, two spend only one per cent. The number of hours spent weekly on board meetings and interviews varies from 4.2 to 0.4. The mean number of hours given to board meetings and interviews by all of the inspectors is 1.78.

Travel for professional purposes. Supervising inspectors are relatively transient people since school systems are spread over large areas. The percentage of their time spent on travel is shown in Table XLVII. Five inspectors reported that they spend from 10 to 14 per cent of their time on travel, and nine use from five to nine per cent of their time for this purpose. Only two supervisors spend less than five per cent of their time on travel. The number of hours spent on travel weekly varies from 8.4 to one hour, the mean being 3.3 hours.

Other reports and correspondence. Supervisors stated that considerable time is spent on reports in addition to those associated with instruction, and on correspondence. Although eight inspectors spend no more than two per cent of their time on this aspect of their work, four spend from three to five per cent, and four, more than six per cent. The mean number of hours spent on other reports and correspondence weekly is 2.1. Supervising inspectors are not provided with clerical assistance but must perform their clerical tasks themselves.

In-service training. The amount of time given to personal in-service training varies among the supervising inspectors. Although four spend no more than two per cent of their time in activities related to



TABLE XLVII

PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT ON TRAVEL BY SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

Percentage of Time	Number of Supervising Inspectors
10 - 14	5
5 - 9	9
0 - 4	2
Number of supervising inspectors	16
Mean number of hours weekly	3.3





professional development, nine spend from three to five per cent, and three from six to nine per cent. The mean number of hours devoted to in-service training weekly is 2.1.

Miscellaneous activities. Several of the supervisors stated that small percentages of their time are spent in miscellaneous activities. Four inspectors spend from one per cent to seven per cent of their time in such activities. The mean number of hours spent weekly in miscellaneous activities is 0.70.

#### Desirable Distribution of the Supervisor's Time

In the interest of educational efficiency, supervising inspectors would like to re-distribute the time spent on various administrative duties. Although greater acceptance by boards of educational leadership would admit of some re-distribution of time, school district re-organization would seem to be required for maximum efficiency. Eleven inspectors would like to reduce the amount of time given to instructional supervision. While the mean percentage of time devoted to this function at present is 68.7 per cent, supervisors would like to spend no more than 60.6 per cent of their time on it. A majority of the inspectors wish to increase the percentage of time given to the execution of school board policies. Twelve inspectors responded to the question in this manner. An increase in the percentage of time devoted to their advisory function to boards was also considered desirable by eleven of the supervisors.

In several other ways, supervisors desire a re-distribution of their time. Several would like to spend less time on travel, and a



majority would like more time for personal in-service training.

Specifically, they would like to increase the time spent on in-service training from 4 to 7.3 per cent of the total time given to educational administration.

#### Least Attractive and Most Attractive Aspects of Work

In response to the question relating to the least attractive aspects of their work, the supervisors listed a substantial number of undesirable characteristics, many of which are common to several inspectors. Seven supervisors stated that they regard reporting to boards and to the Department on teachers as an undesirable feature of their responsibilities. It seems that, at times, reports are used indiscriminately by boards to dismiss teachers. The amount of travel required to perform their duties was considered an unattractive aspect of the job by seven inspectors. Five stated that the large number of ineffective teachers whom they supervise is a most discouraging aspect of their work and four mentioned working with ineffective boards. Having to teach at probationers' summer school was mentioned by four inspectors, compiling and writing reports without clerical assistance by three, and the impossibility of doing an effective job by three others. Low remuneration was submitted by two inspectors as an unattractive aspect of the position, while one stated that the attitude of the Department towards the service is most discouraging. No provision for self-improvement and lack of authority were other reasons given by two inspectors as unattractive aspects of their positions.

The inspectors listed several attractive aspects of the position.



A large majority of the inspectors felt that the job offers an opportunity to promote teacher effectiveness. Six reported that the improvements in all aspects of education resulting from their efforts are indeed rewarding, while three emphasized the opportunity which the position offers to provide leadership at the local level. Six supervisors stated that workshops and conferences stimulate their interests in education, and three submitted that working with some boards brings a sense of satisfaction. The variety of tasks performed tends to make the job challenging for three of the supervisors. Working with principals, the opportunity afforded to do professional writing, and the freedom to innovate in a limited way were also given as attractive characteristics of the position.

## V. SUMMARY

The third section of the questionnaire sought to provide information for an analysis of the administrative role of the supervising inspector in his relationships with school boards, principals and teachers, and the Department of Education. The views of the inspector on the effectiveness of his functions were also solicited and his work load was analyzed.

Only 55 per cent of the 220 boards in sixteen districts had been requesting professional assistance from the inspectors in the administration of their schools. Almost one hundred school boards functioned without the professional services of supervising inspectors, except for those services which were regulatory. All of the inspectors







were able to give more assistance to boards than they were now giving. The inspectors suggested, however, that in the interest of educational efficiency the Department of Education should provide for a larger supervisory staff, and that board consolidation on both a denominational and an amalgamated basis should be effected. Although they advised and sometimes assisted boards in the execution of various administrative tasks, in no instances did supervising inspectors act as executive officers for their boards. School boards acted as administrators themselves. While all of the inspectors participated in selecting and placing teachers and a majority advised or assisted in selecting and placing principals, few inspectors had been delegated any responsibility for hiring caretakers, organizing pupil transportation, and budgeting school funds.

Supervising inspectors devoted a major portion of their working time to instructional supervision. The mean number of seven-hour days devoted to this function annually was 176.4. The most frequently employed supervisory technique was classroom visitation in which the mean number of days spent was 145. The second most frequently used supervisory technique was group meetings and conferences with teachers. The mean number of days given to meetings and conferences by all inspectors was 12.6. Very little time was devoted to organizing principals' supervisory programs and to program development, the mean days being only 8.8. All of the supervisors regarded instructional supervision as a means of improving the total learning situation; however, most of them felt that their supervisory programs were inadequate. A majority



stated that their programs were limited because of the large number of schools for which they were responsible, and six considered the problem of number to be compounded by the large areas over which schools were scattered. Unqualified teachers, hazardous travel conditions, lack of suitable materials and equipment, teacher turnover, lack of office facilities and clerical assistance, and "voluminous" report writing were also considered impediments to a satisfactory supervisory program. Methods advocated by the inspectors for the improvement of instructional supervision included the establishment of smaller supervisory districts in area and in number of educational personnel, larger school units, and provision for clerical assistance and assistant supervisors.

A majority of the inspectors reported that the Department of Education encouraged their participation in the formulation of provincial educational policies; however, many inspectors were unable to participate actively in formulating such policies because of the demands of their other tasks.

The mean number of hours spent in administration weekly by the supervising inspectors was forty-eight. The distribution of their time among various functions was reported as follows: instructional supervision, 32.4 hours; executing board policies, 1.74 hours; work for the Department, 3.87 hours; attendance at board meetings and interviews with members, 1.78 hours; travel, 3.3 hours; reports except those relating to supervision, and correspondence, 2.1 hours; in-service training, 2.1 hours; and miscellaneous activities, 0.70 hours. The inspectors wished to re-distribute the time spent on their various administrative duties,



reducing the amount of time given to instructional supervision and increasing that spent in executing school board policies and in advising boards on educational policies. Several inspectors wished to spend less time on travel and a majority wanted more time for personal in-service training.

The supervisors listed a number of unattractive aspects of their work among which were the following: reporting to boards and to the Department on teacher effectiveness, travel involved in performing duties, large numbers of ineffective teachers to supervise, working with ineffective school boards, lack of clerical assistance, efforts spread too thinly, low remuneration and lack of authority. Among the attractive aspects of their work, inspectors mentioned the opportunity to promote teacher improvement, to improve all aspects of education and to provide leadership.







## CHAPTER VII

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### I. SUMMARY

This section of the chapter presents a summary of the major findings from the study which included an examination of The Education Act with respect to the legal status of the supervising inspector, correspondence with the Department of Education regarding the selection of supervising inspectors, and the questionnaires completed by seventeen district supervising inspectors in Newfoundland.

1. An examination of the duties of the supervising inspector as outlined in The Education Act revealed that emphasis has been placed upon instructional supervision and upon the regulatory function of inspection. The supervising inspector's status as an advisor and an executive officer to boards has not been clearly defined.

2. Instructional supervision is performed under the direction of the Department of Education and not under the direction of local boards of education. Very few powers have been vested in the supervising inspector by The Education Act.

3. Although the Act states that supervising inspectors may be appointed by the Minister of Education, selection is made usually by one of the chief superintendents and the Deputy Minister, since the inspector in each district is of the religious denomination which is predominant in that district.



4. At present, the minimum qualifications required for appointment to the position include the possession of a university degree as well as several years of successful teaching experience. The number of applicants for each position, however, is often very small, probably because of conditions of work, and remuneration which is less than the remuneration of well qualified principals.

5. The total area of sixteen supervisory districts is 20,465 square miles, the mean area being 1,279 square miles. The average number of communities in each supervisory district is 32.2 and the mean number of schools in all districts is forty-eight.

6. In 1963-64, the sixteen districts had a total student population of 73,004. Although one supervising inspector was responsible for only 2,600 pupils, one had more than 11,000 in his district and another more than 8,000. The mean enrollment for all districts was 4,562.75. More than 23 per cent of the total pupil population attended schools having not more than two classrooms, and more than 44 per cent were enrolled in schools with less than five classrooms. Only 21.6 per cent of all pupils attended schools with more than ten rooms. Protestant groups together, operated a proportionately larger number of small schools than were operated under the Roman Catholic authority.

7. Sixteen supervising inspectors were assigned officially to 220 local boards of education. Although one inspector was associated with only four boards, two had twenty boards or more in their supervisory districts. Many districts had from two to six school boards of the same religious denomination and in the majority of districts all





religious denominations were represented, hence the large number of boards in relation to the student population.

8. Four hundred eighty-five principals were employed in all schools with more than one room. Altogether, there were 2,093 teachers employed in all schools, including teachers in one-room schools. The mean number of principals for the sixteen districts was 30.31 and the mean number of teachers, 130.81. Although five inspectors had more than 150 teachers in their supervisory districts, eleven had 130 teachers or less.

9. The professional qualifications of principals and teachers were as follows: three principals had attained masters' degrees, thirteen, two bachelors' degrees, and sixty-three a bachelor's degree in education. Seventy-five per cent of the 480 principals, whose qualifications were reported, had not more than two years of university training, and more than 27 per cent had less than one year of training. Only two teachers had masters' degrees, and ten, two bachelors' degrees. Although 107 and 57 teachers had four and three years of university training, beyond grade eleven, respectively, more than 90 per cent had not more than two years of training. More than 50 per cent of all teachers, or 1,080, had less than one year of professional training.

10. The experience of principals and teachers in administration and teaching, respectively, was distributed as follows: 79 principals had one year; 257 had not more than five years; 146 had more than ten years; 971 of 2,053 teachers had not more than two years; 1,475 had less than six years; and 262 had more than ten years.





11. Only two of the seventeen inspectors had masters' degrees, one of which was in Education. Eleven had one bachelor's degree with a major in Education, and one, a bachelor of science degree. Three inspectors held no degree of any kind. The mean number of years spent as classroom teachers by the supervising inspectors was 4.53. Although eight had from four to nine years of experience as classroom teachers, four had no experience in this capacity. While three inspectors had from six to nine years in elementary teaching, eight had not more than one year and six had never been classroom teachers of elementary grades. The mean number of years spent as classroom teachers at the elementary and high school levels by all inspectors was 2.59 and 1.94, respectively.

12. Most of the experience in education which supervising inspectors had, prior to their present appointments, was gained as principals of small schools. The mean number of years spent as teaching and/or full-time principals by the inspectors was 8.7 and no inspector had less than two years of experience as a school principal. The mean number of rooms of the largest schools administered by the inspectors, as principals, however, was only 8.44. Most of the inspectors had spent several years in their present positions, five only, having retained their present job for less than four years. The mean number of years spent in the superintendency by all inspectors was 9.35.

13. A majority of the inspectors reported that they had received inadequate administrative preparation for their duties before becoming inspectors. Although a majority had benefited from in-service training, most of the supervisors were emphatic in stating a need for



additional preparation for their administrative role. Nine inspectors stressed the need for training in educational administration, especially supervision. Six felt that specialization in primary and elementary subject areas, especially in reading, was desirable. A need for training in curriculum development, remedial work, and public relations was also expressed. In eight of the supervisory districts, twenty principals had attained higher qualifications than their supervising inspectors, and in seven districts, twenty-four teachers had acquired more formal training than the supervisors themselves.

14. Only 55 per cent of the 220 boards in sixteen districts had been requesting professional assistance from the inspectors in the administration of their schools. The percentage of boards requesting assistance varied from five per cent, in one district, to 100 per cent, in three districts. Almost one hundred school boards functioned without the professional services of a provincially appointed superintendent, except for those services which may be classified as regulatory.

15. All of the supervising inspectors stated that they were able to give more assistance to their boards than they were now giving. While the mean number of meetings convened with all boards annually was only 1.75, supervisors reported that they could meet with boards almost five times, as an average, yearly. The sixteen inspectors showed unanimity in expressing a need for increased assistance to school boards. While they were able to provide more assistance than was being given, the inspectors suggested that to promote educational efficiency the Department of Education should provide for a larger supervisory staff,





and that board consolidation on both a denominational and an amalgamated basis should be effected. Also, the Department, through various means, should encourage school boards to utilize the services which could be provided by the supervising inspectors.

16. Although their responsibilities for the administration of school board duties extended from no involvement at all to the provision of assistance in the execution of administrative tasks, in no instances did supervising inspectors act as executive officers for their boards. School boards acted as administrators themselves. All of the inspectors participated in the selection and placement of teachers and the majority advised or assisted in selecting and placing principals. Twelve inspectors reported that they either advised or assisted in planning school buildings, however, only four had any responsibilities for selecting maintenance personnel. Although seven inspectors acted in an advisory capacity when buildings and equipment were in a state of disrepair and three assisted boards in arranging for repairs, six inspectors were not involved with this duty. A majority of the inspectors had been delegated no responsibility for the organization of pupil transportation and two only stated that they advised boards on financial matters.

17. Among the most satisfying aspects of their relationships with school boards, eight inspectors stated that they found board acceptance of their services to be satisfactory in some instances. Four reported that their ability to provide assistance to boards, when requested, was most satisfying and two mentioned the assistance rendered in the formulation of school board policies. Two other inspectors





regarded their participation in teacher selection as a source of satisfaction. Summarizing the most difficult aspects of their relationships with school boards, five inspectors stated that many boards were indifferent to their potential services and two reported that their boards were reluctant to invite them to meetings. Ensuring that boards expend their funds properly, board indifference to educational problems, and board-teacher relationships were also mentioned as being difficult aspects of their relationships with school boards.

18. Supervising inspectors devoted a major portion of their working time to instructional supervision. Five supervisors spent 200 seven-hour days or more on this function, seven spent from 152 to 190 days and four only, spent less than 135 days. The mean number of seven-hour days devoted to instructional supervision annually was 176.4. Six supervisors spent from 151 to 207 days in classroom visitation and nine from 104 to 148 days. Only one supervisor devoted less than one hundred days to this supervisory technique. The mean number of days spent in classroom visitation by all inspectors was 145 and the mean days per teacher was 1.27. The second most frequently employed supervisory technique was group meetings and conferences with teachers. The mean number of days given to meetings and conferences by all inspectors was 12.6. Supervising inspectors spent several days on teachers' workshops, the mean being 5.1. The number of days spent in organizing principals' supervisory programs and in assisting with program development was only 141, with the mean being 8.8 days.

19. All of the supervisors regarded instructional supervision as



a means of improving the total learning situation in their schools through stimulation of teacher effort and through educational leadership. Fifteen of the inspectors, however, felt that their supervisory programs were inadequate. Twelve stated that their programs were limited because of the large number of schools for which they were responsible. Six considered the problem of number to be compounded by the large areas over which schools were scattered. Unqualified teachers, hazardous travel conditions, lack of suitable materials and equipment, teacher turnover, lack of office facilities and clerical assistance, and "voluminous" report writing were also considered impediments to a satisfactory program of instructional supervision.

20. The inspectors listed a number of methods by which their supervisory programs might be improved. The majority of suggestions called for smaller supervisory districts, both in area and in number of educational personnel. Two inspectors suggested that the establishment of larger school units would alleviate the problem of providing adequate supervision. Provision for clerical assistance and for assistant supervisors was also advocated as methods of improving instructional supervision.

21. A majority of the inspectors reported that the Department of Education encouraged their participation in the formulation of provincial educational policies. Only four inspectors felt that insufficient encouragement was given. Many of the supervisors, however, stated that they would like to be more active in formulating policies, if their other tasks were made less demanding.





22. The number of hours spent in administration weekly by the sixteen inspectors varied from eighty-four to less than forty. Three inspectors spent more than fifty-four hours on their duties, six from forty-five to fifty, and five spent forty hours on their job each week. The mean number of hours spent in administration weekly was forty-eight. The distribution of their time among various functions was reported as follows: instructional supervision, 32.4 hours; executing board policies, 1.74 hours; work for the Department, 3.87 hours; attendance at board meetings and interviews with members, 1.78 hours; travel, 3.3 hours; reports except those relating to supervision, and correspondence, 2.1 hours; in-service training, 2.1 hours; and miscellaneous activities, 0.70 hours.

23. Supervising inspectors wished to re-distribute the time spent on their various administrative duties. Eleven inspectors would like to reduce the amount of time given to instructional supervision and a majority desired to increase the percentage of time spent in executing school board policies and in advising boards on educational policies. Several supervisors wished to spend less time on travel and a majority wanted more time for personal in-service training.

24. The supervisors listed a number of unattractive aspects of their work among which were the following: reporting to boards and to the Department on teacher effectiveness, travel involved in performing duties, large numbers of ineffective teachers to supervise, working with ineffective school boards, lack of clerical assistance, efforts spread too thinly, low remuneration, no provision for self-improvement,





and lack of authority. Among the attractive features of the position, supervisors mentioned the opportunity to promote teacher improvements, to improve all aspects of education and to provide leadership. Also mentioned were the stimulation received from workshops and conferences, the variety of tasks to be performed, and the freedom to innovate in a limited way.

## II. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions stated here arise out of the analysis of data and findings presented in the study. These conclusions support the five hypotheses advanced in the study and are as follows:

1. The legal status of the supervising inspector, as defined in The Education Act, 1960, seems to need some clarification, especially with respect to supervisor-board relationships. School boards are not encouraged by the Act to seek the professional assistance of inspectors in the administration of their schools and supervising inspectors are not fully encouraged to provide assistance.

2. The present practice of having instructional supervision performed under the direction of the Department of Education rather than under the direction of school boards plus the fact that few other powers have been delegated to the inspectors may not be conducive to boards' acceptance of the leadership which could be provided by the supervising inspectors.

3. As a group, supervising inspectors do not seem to be well qualified academically for their job. Their level of formal training



would seem to be below what is customary in Canada for provincially appointed superintendents, and does not reach the standards suggested in the literature for the school superintendent. Although the inspectors have had several years of experience in education, primarily as teaching and/or full-time principals and as inspectors, a large percentage have had very limited experience in elementary teaching which makes it difficult for them to understand and meet the educational needs of these grades.

4. The large number of small schools in the supervisory districts of Newfoundland militates against an adequate supervisory program, since the principals of these schools are teaching principals. Large numbers of principals and teachers with inadequate professional training and experience add to the supervising inspectors' task of providing adequate instructional supervision, and distract attention from other pressing needs such as giving leadership in program development.

5. A mean number of 4,563 pupils, 161 staff personnel and almost fourteen school boards in each supervisory district would seem to indicate that the tasks of providing adequate instructional supervision, and adequate guidance for boards are impossible ones for supervising inspectors to perform without assistance. The inspectors, themselves, feel that their efforts in their performed functions are too thinly spread for the desired effectiveness. For maximum educational efficiency, a reorganization of school systems and of supervisory districts would seem to be necessary.

6. The potential work loads of the supervising inspectors seem to



be distributed inequably since great variations occur in student enrollment, staff personnel and number of boards in supervisory districts.

7. All of the inspectors are able to provide increased and more varied assistance for boards than is presently being given and which the inspectors feel that boards need. It seems that the functions of supervising inspectors are not clearly understood by boards and thus the inspectors' potential services are not fully utilized by some boards and are not utilized at all by others. Supervising inspectors are performing only some of the functions which are being assigned to provincially appointed superintendents elsewhere in Canada and which are suggested in the literature for the superintendency.

8. Supervising inspectors may be regarded primarily as supervisors of instruction, since they devote almost 70 per cent of their time to it. A majority of them, however, would like to re-distribute their time, placing greater emphasis upon the execution of school board policies and upon their advisory role to school boards.

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions discussed in the preceding section indicate that many factors make it difficult for supervising inspectors in Newfoundland to perform in an efficient and effective manner those functions which are usually assigned to provincially appointed school superintendents. The following recommendations are respectfully submitted as possible contributions to more effective administration in the supervisory districts.

1. The Department of Education should initiate a revision of The







Education Act for the purpose of improving supervisor-board relationships. In addition to the clarification of the supervising inspector's advisory and executive functions, provision should be made for instructional supervision to be performed under the direction of school boards. More authority should also be vested in the supervising inspectors themselves. School boards should be encouraged by the chief superintendents and by other Department personnel to utilize the professional assistance which the supervising inspectors are able to give. In these and possibly other ways board acceptance of professional assistance should be promoted.

2. In order to improve the effectiveness of educational administration in the supervisory districts, consolidation of school boards should be effected wherever possible on both a denominational and an amalgamated basis. The Department of Education and representatives of the Protestant denominations should seriously consider school district reorganization in the province.

3. Small school units, especially those teaching high school grades, should be abandoned wherever possible and replaced by larger central and regional schools. Board consolidation, both denominationally and by amalgamation, would facilitate the establishment of larger school units. Such units would admit of more competent administration by principals and would enable school boards to increase the number of instructional supervisors appointed by them under the present financial arrangements with the Department of Education.

4. The Department of Education should make a thorough study of the potential work loads of supervising inspectors the purposes of which



should be to occasion an equable distribution of responsibilities among them and assignment of an optimum number of school boards and staff personnel in each supervisory district. The provincial supervisory staff should be increased as a result of the study so as to ensure efficient school board operation and effective instructional supervision in each supervisory district.

5. It is recommended that the educational qualifications required for the position of supervising inspector be raised and that the Department of Education consider assisting otherwise able inspectors to obtain such qualifications by making such provisions as sabbatical leaves and paid attendance at summer schools. In order to retain incumbents with desirable academic and professional qualifications and to attract qualified personnel to the position, salaries should be raised substantially. It would seem that the salaries of supervising inspectors should be equal to, if not greater than, those of the most highly qualified principals.

6. At present supervising inspectors are not provided with office facilities or clerical assistance in their supervisory districts. To enable the inspectors to operate in the most highly organized manner possible and to prevent a loss of leadership because of time unduly spent on routine and trivial clerical tasks, it is recommended that the Department of Education procure office space for the inspectors and that consideration be given to the provision of secretarial assistance in every supervisory district.

7. Larger school boards in the more industrialized and more



densely populated areas (possibly those which employ forty to fifty teachers or more) should appoint their own executive officers or local superintendents whose duties would be similar to those of locally appointed superintendents in other parts of Canada and the United States.

8. Supervising inspectors should be encouraged by the Department of Education and should attempt on their own initiative to give more leadership to local boards. Although in the final analysis the prerogative to accept the required leadership rests with local boards, the inspectors themselves, having acquired adequate training in educational administration, should be able to motivate and inspire their boards to some extent in soliciting the professional assistance which they invariably need.





## BIBLIOGRAPHY



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BOOKS

- Campbell, R. F., J. E. Corbally, Jr., and J. A. Ramseyer. Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1958.
- Engelhardt, F. Public School Organization and Administration. New York: Ginn and Company, 1931.
- Frecker, G. A. Education in the Atlantic Provinces. Toronto: W. J. Gage and Company, Ltd., 1956.
- Grieder, C., T. M. Pierce and W. E. Rosenstengel. Public School Administration. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1961.
- Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Hagman, H. L. The Administration of the American Public Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1951.
- Jacobson, P. B., C. W. Reavis, and J. D. Logsdon. Duties of School Principals, Second Edition. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951.
- McNerney, C. T. Educational Supervision. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1951.
- Moore, H. A. Jr. Studies in School Administration. Washington 6, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1957.
- Phillips, C. E. The Development of Education in Canada. Toronto: W. J. Gage and Co., Ltd., 1957.
- Reeder, E. H. Supervision in the Elementary School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1953.
- Reeves, C. E. School Boards--Their Status, Functions and Activities. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.
- Ross, D. H. Some Arguments for Requiring a More Rigorous Preparation For Chief School Administrators. Albany, N.Y.: The Co-Operative Development of Public School Administration, State Education Department, 1954.
- Rowe, F. W. The History of Education in Newfoundland. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1952.



## ESSAYS AND ARTICLES IN COLLECTIONS

- Althouse, J. G. "The Inspector of Schools, Executive and Policy-Maker," Leadership for the Improvement of Instruction. Thirteenth Yearbook, Ontario School Inspectors' Association. Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Company, 1957, pp. 3-10.
- Boulanger, T. "The Changing Role of the School Inspector," Leadership in Action: The Superintendent of Schools in Canada. G. E. Flower and F. K. Stewart, editors. Toronto: W. J. Gage, Ltd., 1958, pp. 127-136.
- Elliott, C. M. "The Superintendent's Work With Groups," The Canadian Superintendent. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1959, pp. 33-38.
- Flower, G. E. "Professional Growth of the Superintendent," The Canadian Superintendent. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1959, pp. 57-62.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and F. K. Stewart. "Introduction," Leadership in Action: The Superintendent of Schools in Canada. Toronto: W. J. Gage, Ltd., 1958.
- Goldring, C. C. "The Superintendent of Schools as a Local Leader," Leadership in Action: The Superintendent of Schools in Canada. G. E. Flower and F. K. Stewart, editors. Toronto: W. J. Gage, Ltd., 1958, pp. 86-102.
- Lorimer, W. C. "Administration for Effective Education," The Canadian Superintendent. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1959, pp. 53-56.
- Peterson, E. G. "The Superintendent and Educational Policy," The Canadian Superintendent. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1959, pp. 22-25.
- Riddell, R. A. "The Supervising Official and Improvement in Teaching," Leadership for the Improvement of Instruction. Thirteenth Yearbook, Ontario School Inspectors' Association. Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Company, 1957, pp. 20-21.
- Sharp, R. F. "Making the Administrative System Work," Leadership in Action: The Superintendent of Schools in Canada. Toronto: W. J. Gage, Ltd., 1958, pp. 141-151.
- Simpson, D. W. "The Leadership Role of the County Inspector," Leadership for the Improvement of Instruction. Thirteenth Yearbook, Ontario School Inspectors' Association. Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Co., 1957, pp. 22-27.





## LEGAL AND LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

Government of Newfoundland. The Education (Remuneration of Teachers and Grants to Boards) Regulations, 1958.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Education (Teachers' Salaries) Regulations, 1963.

Public Statutes of Nova Scotia, The Education Act, 1953, 2 Elizabeth II c. 4, s. 5.

Regulations of the Protestant Committee of the Council of Education of Quebec, 1958, No. 115.

Revised Statutes of Alberta, The School Act, 1955, 4 Elizabeth II, c. 297, s. 199.

Revised Statutes of Prince Edward Island, The School Act, 1951, c. 145, No. 6.

Revised Statutes of New Brunswick, The Schools Act, 1959, 8 Elizabeth II, c. 204, s. 10.

Revised Statutes of Quebec, Education Act, 1941, c. 59, s. 55.

The Revised Statutes of British Columbia, Public Schools Act, 1958, 7 Elizabeth II, c. 42, s. 9.

The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, 1 Elizabeth II, c. 102 and c. 105.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1956, 5 Elizabeth II, no. 8.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Education Act, 1960, 9 Elizabeth II, no. 50.

The Revised Statutes of Ontario, The Public Schools Act, 1950, c. 316, s. 123.

The Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, The Larger School Units Act, 1953, 2 Elizabeth II, c. 170, s. 91.

## PERIODICALS

Byrne, T. C. "Supervision as Curriculum Development," Canadian Education, XII (September, 1957), pp. 37-51.

Flower, G. E. "School Administration Has Come of Age," School Progress, XVII (April-May, 1958), pp. 32-47.



Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago. "What About Improving Instruction?" Administrator's Notebook (January, 1957), pp. 1-4.

National Education Association. "Progress in Rural Education," Research Bulletin, XVIII (September, 1940), pp. 135-170.

Schmidt, R. L. W. "Supervisory Responsibilities of the Superintendent in Elementary Grades of Small School Systems," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXIX (January, 1953), pp. 27-35.

Young, C. M. "From a Superintendent to Superintendents," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXI (March, 1945), pp. 179-181.

#### PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of School Administrators. The American School Superintendency, Thirtieth Yearbook. Washington 6, D.C.: National Education Association, 1952.

\_\_\_\_\_. Professional Administrators for America's Schools. Thirty-Eighth Yearbook. Washington 6, D. C.: National Education Association, 1960.

\_\_\_\_\_. School Boards in Action. Twenty-Fourth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1946.

\_\_\_\_\_, and the Research Division of the National Education Association. Profile of the School Superintendent. Washington 6, D.C.: National Education Association, 1960.

Canadian Education Association. Educational Leadership in the Superintendency. Report of the 1954 Short Course. Toronto: Canadian Education Association, 1954.

Division of Educational Administration, University of Alberta. Administration in the County of Sturgeon #15. Edmonton: Division of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, 1962.

\_\_\_\_\_. Projects in Canadian School Administration. Report of the Banff Regional Conference of School Administrators. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1959, pp. 30-36.

Government of Newfoundland. Annual Report of the Department of Education for the Year Ending March 31, 1963.





\_\_\_\_\_. Statistical Supplement to the Annual Report for the Year Ended June 30, 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_. Annual Reports of the Department of Education for the Years 1944-45 and 1948-49.

The Canadian Association of School Superintendents and Inspectors. "The Position of the School Superintendent in Newfoundland," The Canadian Superintendent, V (May, 1957), pp. 78-81.

#### UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Acreman, John. Assistant Superintendent of Education, U.C. Division, Department of Education. Letter addressed to the investigator, November, 1964.

Collins, C. P. "The Role of the Provincially Appointed Superintendent of Schools in Larger Units of Administration in Canada." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1958.

Dawe, R. L. Superintendent of Education, Anglican Division, Department of Education. Letter addressed to the investigator, September, 1964.

Finlay, J. H. "Expectations of School Boards for the Role of the Provincially Appointed Superintendent of Schools in Alberta." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1961.

Hencley, S. P. "A Descriptive Survey of the Alberta Divisional and County School Superintendent." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1958.

Kirby, F. Professional Assistant to the Deputy Minister of Education. Letters addressed to the investigator, August, September, 1964.

Malmberg, H. "The Principal as a Supervisor of Instruction in the Regional High School Districts of New Brunswick." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1959.

Matson, O. L. "Conflict in the Executive Function of the Administration of the Large School Units of Alberta." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1964.

Miller, S. A. "A Comparative Study of Supervision in the Various Canadian Provinces, with a View to Determining the Optimum Load for Supervisors of Each Type." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1946.





Ready, L. M. "The Preparation Needs of Superintendents in Large Administrative Units in Saskatchewan." Unpublished Doctoral thesis, University of Alberta, 1961.

Roebathan, C. W. "A Study of the Operation of Anglican School Boards in Newfoundland." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1962.

\_\_\_\_\_. Assistant Superintendent of Education, Anglican Division, Department of Education. Letters addressed to the investigator, August, September, 1964.

Stewart, L. D. "An Analysis of the Role of the Assistant Superintendent in Alberta School Divisions and Counties." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1961.

Tucker, O. G. "Centralized High Schools in Newfoundland." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1963.

Warren, P. J. "Leadership Expectations of the Principal in Newfoundland's Regional and Central High Schools as Perceived by Principals and Staffs." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1959.



## APPENDIX



P. O. Box 157,  
Labrador City, Newfoundland,  
May 25, 1964.

Mr.  
District Supervising Inspector,  
Newfoundland.

Dear Mr.

I am enclosing a questionnaire which is designed to gather information for a thesis surveying the setting in which the district supervising inspector of Newfoundland works, his qualifications, functions, work load, and his attitudes towards his functions and work load.

This study is being done to complete an M.Ed. degree in the Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta. Dr. G. A. Frecker, Minister of Education for Newfoundland, has approved and encouraged the project.

Would you kindly complete this questionnaire? I realize that it might be somewhat time consuming and would suggest that you not attempt to complete it all at one sitting. I have attempted to organize it so that a minimum of your time will be required. Please fill in all questions as accurately as possible and to the best of your judgment where judgments are required. Elaborate on explanations and comments as much as possible.

When you have finished, please slip the questionnaire into the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope. Your assistance in the project is very much appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Vernon J. Snelgrove

VJS:sem  
Encl.









F. How many elementary schools (Grades I-VI or VIII), including pupil enrollment, with the following number of classrooms (home-rooms) are under your supervision in your district?

NUMBER OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND PUPIL ENROLLMENT

	Amal.	R.C.	Ang.	U.C.	S.A.	Pent.	Others
One room	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Two rooms	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Three rooms	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Four rooms	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Five rooms	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Six-ten rooms	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
More than ten	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total Number of Elementary Schools	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—



- G. How many high schools (central or regional, Grades VII or IX-XI) (XII), including pupil enrollment, with the following number of classrooms (home-rooms) are under your supervision in your district?

NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOLS AND PUPIL ENROLLMENT

	Amal.	R.C.	Ang.	U.C.	S.A.	Pent.	Others
One room	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Two rooms	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Three rooms	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Four rooms	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Five rooms	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Six-ten rooms	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
More than ten	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total Number of High Schools	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total Enrollment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—





H. Would you please list any types of schools, with pupil enrollment, not included in E, F and G for which you are responsible in your district?

## NUMBER OF OTHER TYPES OF SCHOOLS AND PUPIL ENROLLMENT

Type	Amal.	R.C.	Ang.	U.C.	S.A.	Pent.	Others
One room							
Enrollment							
Two rooms							
Enrollment							
Three rooms							
Enrollment							
Four rooms							
Enrollment							
Five rooms							
Enrollment							
Six-ten rooms							
Enrollment							
More than ten							
Enrollment							
Total Number of Schools							
Total Enrollment							







J. Would you indicate the number of schools in I above which

1. Come under the supervision of another supervising inspector \_\_\_\_\_

2. Do not come under the supervision of a supervising inspector \_\_\_\_\_

Total number of schools \_\_\_\_\_

K. With how many school boards are you officially associated in your district?

Number of Boards

Amalgamated \_\_\_\_\_

Roman Catholic \_\_\_\_\_

Anglican \_\_\_\_\_

United Church \_\_\_\_\_

Salvation Army \_\_\_\_\_

Pentecostal \_\_\_\_\_

Others \_\_\_\_\_

Total \_\_\_\_\_

L. If there are any school boards in your geographic area with which you are not associated, please indicate the number:

Number of Boards

Amalgamated \_\_\_\_\_

Roman Catholic \_\_\_\_\_

Anglican \_\_\_\_\_

United Church \_\_\_\_\_

Salvation Army \_\_\_\_\_

Pentecostal \_\_\_\_\_

Others \_\_\_\_\_

Total \_\_\_\_\_





M. Would you please indicate the number of school boards in L above which

1. Come under the supervision of another supervising inspector \_\_\_\_\_

2. Do not come under the supervision of a supervising inspector \_\_\_\_\_

Total number of boards \_\_\_\_\_

N. How many teachers (including one-room schools but excluding principals) are under your supervision having the following qualifications?

Teaching license \_\_\_\_\_

Grade I \_\_\_\_\_

Grade II \_\_\_\_\_

Grade III \_\_\_\_\_

Grade IV \_\_\_\_\_

Grade V \_\_\_\_\_

Grade VI \_\_\_\_\_

Grade VII \_\_\_\_\_

Total number of teachers \_\_\_\_\_

O. How many teaching and full-time principals (excluding one-room schools) are under your supervision having the following qualifications?

Teaching license \_\_\_\_\_

Grade I \_\_\_\_\_

Grade II \_\_\_\_\_

Grade III \_\_\_\_\_

Grade IV \_\_\_\_\_

Grade V \_\_\_\_\_

Grade VI \_\_\_\_\_

Grade VII \_\_\_\_\_

Total number of principals \_\_\_\_\_



- P. How many teachers (including one-room schools but excluding principals) are under your supervision having the following number of years experience?

Experience (including this year)

One year	_____
Two years	_____
Three-five years	_____
Six-ten years	_____
More than ten years	_____
Total number of teachers	_____

- Q. How many teaching and full-time principals (excluding one-room schools) are under your supervision having the following number of years experience?

Experience as principal (including this year)

One year	_____
Two years	_____
Three-five years	_____
Six-ten years	_____
More than ten years	_____
Total number of principals	_____



## II. BACKGROUND OF SUPERVISING INSPECTOR

### A. Teaching and Administrative Experience

1. Total number of years teaching experience (excluding years as a teaching and/or full-time principal) \_\_\_\_\_
2. Number of years as a teacher of elementary grades (Grades I-VIII) \_\_\_\_\_
3. Number of years as a teacher of high school grades (Grades IX-XI, XII) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Number of years as teaching and/or full-time principal \_\_\_\_\_
5. Largest number of rooms supervised as a principal \_\_\_\_\_
6. Number of years as a supervising inspector (including this year) \_\_\_\_\_

### B. Class of Certificate and Degree(s)

1. Which teaching grade do you hold? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Which degree(s) do you hold? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Partial degree(s). Specify \_\_\_\_\_

### C. Preparation for Supervising Inspector

1. What specific administrative preparation, other than that implied in A and B above, have you had which you feel has helped in your duties as supervising inspector
  - (a) before becoming a supervising inspector?
  - (b) since becoming a supervising inspector?
2. In your judgment, were you adequately prepared for the responsibilities of a supervising inspector before becoming one?
 

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

Explain: \_\_\_\_\_
3. In what specific areas do you see a need for additional preparation for the job of a supervising inspector?
 

Explain: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Do you belong to a superintendents' association or any study group?
 

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please explain: \_\_\_\_\_





### III. FUNCTIONS AND WORK LOAD OF SUPERVISING INSPECTOR

#### A. Advisory and Executive Functions: Supervisor-Board Relationships

1. What proportion of your school boards solicit your advice and/or assistance on educational matters?
2. How frequently do these boards solicit your advice and/or assistance?  
Always \_\_\_\_\_ Often \_\_\_\_\_ Occasionally \_\_\_\_\_ Seldom \_\_\_\_\_
3. When your advice or assistance is solicited, in which areas of education are you called on to give most help?  
Explain:
4. Are you able to give full assistance in determining and in executing educational policy in instances where boards do solicit your help?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Explain:
5. On the average, how many times a year do you meet with each board assigned to you in your district? \_\_\_\_\_
6. On the average, how many times a year could you meet with each board if boards called on you for help more often? . \_\_\_\_\_
7. By placing an X in the appropriate column, please indicate how you deal with the following administrative duties. Mark according to the following key:

- (a) take full responsibility
- (b) assist school boards or their representatives
- (c) act in an advisory capacity only to the boards or their representatives
- (d) am in no way involved

	A	B	C	D
i. Hiring and placing of teachers	—	—	—	—
ii. Hiring and placing of principals	—	—	—	—
iii. Planning school buildings	—	—	—	—
iv. Hiring of caretakers	—	—	—	—
v. Deciding on and arranging for repairs to buildings, grounds and equipment	—	—	—	—
vi. Deciding on and purchasing pupil and teacher supplies and equipment	—	—	—	—
vii. Organizing pupil transportation	—	—	—	—
viii. Budgeting of school funds	—	—	—	—



8. Who, as a rule, takes full responsibility, or partial responsibility, for the execution of the preceding administrative duties if you do not assume full responsibility?

- (a) Hiring and placing of teachers \_\_\_\_\_
- (b) Hiring and placing of principals \_\_\_\_\_
- (c) Planning school buildings \_\_\_\_\_
- (d) Hiring of caretakers \_\_\_\_\_
- (e) Deciding on and arranging for repairs to buildings, grounds and equipment \_\_\_\_\_
- (f) Deciding on and purchasing pupil and teacher supplies and equipment \_\_\_\_\_
- (g) Organizing pupil transportation \_\_\_\_\_
- (h) Budgeting of school funds \_\_\_\_\_

9. In your judgment, do school boards need more professional guidance at the local level in determining and in executing educational policy than they receive at present?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Explain:

10. If you think it is necessary that more help should be given, as in 9, above, how should this professional guidance be provided? (e.g., principals, supervising inspectors)  
Explain:

11. How might consolidation of some of the existing school boards assigned to you affect your contribution to education at the local level?  
Explain:

12. Please state the most satisfying and the most difficult aspect of your work in relation to supervisor-board relationships:  
Most satisfying:  
Most difficult:

B. Supervisory Function: Supervisor-Principal-Teacher Relationships

1. On the average, how many visits annually do you make to each school for which you are responsible in your district? \_\_\_\_\_
2. How many seven-hour days annually (total time) do you spend in the following types of activities with all teachers for whom you are responsible in your district?
  - a. classroom visitation including reporting \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. meetings and conferences (group) \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. workshops \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. others \_\_\_\_\_

Total Days \_\_\_\_\_



3. How many seven-hour days annually (total time) do you spend with principals in organizing the principals' supervisory programs, assisting with program development, etc.? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Please describe briefly your general approach to the supervision of instruction.  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. Do you make a formal report to the Department of Education annually on each teacher's effectiveness?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
6. Do you report to school boards annually on each teacher's effectiveness?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
7. Do you regard your total services in instructional supervision to the schools for which you are responsible in your district as adequate insofar as a supervising inspector is concerned?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
8. If your supervisory program is inadequate, list the factors which, in your opinion, limit your supervisory services.
9. If you were asked to improve your supervisory program in the schools, how could it best be effected?

C. Advisory Function: Supervisor-Department of Education Relationships

1. Does the Department of Education encourage your participation in the formulation of provincial educational policy?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
2. If yes, in what way?
3. Do you feel that you could contribute more to provincial educational policy than you actually help to determine?  
Explain:

D. Work Load and Distribution of Supervising Inspector's Time

1. On the average, how many hours do you spend on your job each week? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Are you provided with any clerical assistance? \_\_\_\_\_
3. If your answer to 2 above is yes, how much clerical assistance is provided? \_\_\_\_\_







4. Please estimate the percentage of your working time devoted to each of the various duties listed below. Indicate the percentage of your time that you would regard desirable for the performance of each of the various duties also.

	Present Distribution of Time	Desirable
a. supervision of instruction (classroom visitation, conferences, institutes, workshops, reporting)	—	—
b. Executing board policy (organiza- tion of units and services of the school systems, planning and improving schools, hiring and placing teachers, etc.)	—	—
c. Work for Department (examinations, curriculum, reports)	—	—
d. Attendance at board meetings and interviews with members	—	—
e. Travel for professional purposes	—	—
f. Other reports and correspondence	—	—
g. Personal in-service training (conventions, conferences, courses, professional reading)	—	—
h. Others	—	—

5. Please list the three aspects of your work that you consider least attractive:

6. Please list the three aspects of your work that you consider most attractive:

- E. The researcher would appreciate your making any comments concerning the functions of the supervising inspector and his work load which have not been adequately treated in other parts of the questionnaire.

---

Signature





**B29839**